DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 880 95 JC 770 219

AUTHOR Lombardi, John
TITLE Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs. Topical Paper No. 60.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO TP-60
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 80p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Community Colleges; *Educational Facilities; Educational Finance; Enrollment; Governance; *Junior Colleges; *Organizational Effectiveness; Outreach Programs; Part Time Students; Part Time Teachers; *Post Secondary Education; Special Programs; Student Characteristics; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Chicago City Wide College IL; Chicago Urban Skills Institute IL; Coastline Community College CA; Community College of Vermont; *Noncampus Colleges; Peralta College for Nontraditional Study CA; Pioneer Community College MO; Whatcom Community College WA

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the characteristics of an emerging new type of postsecondary institution, the noncampus college--its facilities, learning activities, organization, financing, students, faculty, and special problems. While maintaining traditional curricular offerings and classroom instructional patterns, noncampus colleges dispense with the fixed campus in favor of rented and donated facilities in many locations. The eight existing noncampus colleges vary in their responsibilities; some provide a full range of academic and occupational programs within a geographically large service area, while others are limited to special types of programs or consolidate all off-campus instruction within a multi-campus district. All maintain a headquarters for administrative and support services. Noncampus colleges exist to serve nontraditional students, particularly adult part-time students, and thus may emphasize alternative learning experiences and instructional methods such as televised instruction or contract learning. However, they remain classroom oriented, and appear unlikely to embrace the external degree or college without walls format. Despite some problems, noncampus colleges provide an efficient and flexible organizational pattern for postsecondary outreach efforts. (JDS)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS).

ED136880

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TOPICAL PAPER NO. 60

NONCAMPUS COLLEGES: NEW GOVERNANCE PATTERNS FOR OUTREACH PROGRAMS

JC 770 219

THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE REPRODUCED FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION AT WILL.

NONCAMPUS COLLEGES:
NEW GOVERNANCE PATTERNS FOR OUTREACH PROGRAMS

by

John Lombardi

Topical Paper No. 60

March 1977

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the UCLA Community College Leadership Program for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the UCLA Community College Leadership Program or the National Institute of Education.

For information about the availability of other Topical Papers, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 96 Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

PREFACE

In the preparation of Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs I am indebted to the authors of the documents listed in the Bibliography, to the educators associated with the noncampus colleges and to my associates on the staff of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. The authors and those who responded to my requests for information are recognized in the Bibliography.

My associates who assisted me in searching the ERIC files are Barbara Booth, Librarian and her assistant Marsha Solomon.

The manuscript was typed by Chilaine Mitchell, Clerk-Typist of ERIC.

The preparation of the manuscript for publication and the compilation of the Bibliography is the work of Bonnie Sanchez, Associate Director of ERIC.

Dr. Arthur M. Cohen, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse, encouraged the writing of the Topical Paper, reviewed the manuscript and made suggestions that have been incorporated in the Paper.

NONCAMPUS COLLEGES:
NEW GOVERNANCE PATTERNS FOR OUTREACH PROGRAMS

John Lombardi

Within the next five years noncampus colleges will be established in many districts throughout the country. By 1976 seven such colleges plus one lower-than-college grade institute had been founded. Two of the colleges are independent entities; the others are members of multicollege districts comprised of from 3 to 10 colleges. All the colleges dispense with the traditional fixed campus in favor of rented and donated facilities scattered throughout the district served. Although these institutions are sometimes called nontraditional, campus beyond walls, institute, or new dimensions, noncampus college is the most commonly used term.

The oldest of the noncampus colleges, Whatcom Community College in the state of Washington, was founded in 1970; followed by the Community College of Vermont in 1971; Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study in 1974; Chicago City-Wide College (formerly Institute) and Chicago Urban Skills Institute in 1975; and Pioneer Community College, Coastline Community College and the Los Angeles Office for New Dimensions in 1976. These are the official dates; all the colleges had varying gestation periods before they became legal entities by action of their respective state and/or local governing bodies. Each of the colleges is accredited or has applied for accreditation.

In addition to this group of "true" noncampus colleges there are others that open temporarily as noncampus colleges by necessity rather than by choice because they do not have the funds for capital construction or they are forced to open classes before completion of construction. Austin Community College in Texas, Wayne Community College in Michigan and Oxnard Community College in California are or were in this category. Though evening colleges have some of the attributes of noncampus colleges they are not included in this group

because of their close association with fixed campuses.

Among major influences in the development of the noncampus colleges are (beside economy of operation to be discussed later) the interest aroused by the English Open University and the University of London, the American University Without Walls, Regents External Degree, Empire State College and the Minnesota Metropolitan State College, all of which offer external degrees; and the Report of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study. (Houle, 1973, has an excellent description and analysis of the External Degree.) Several of the chief administrators responsible for the establishment of the noncampus colleges described in this study have visited England to observe the operations of the Open University and the University of London.

Had there been no colleges without walls as models the noncampus college might still have emerged from the efforts to coordinate the activities of the many outreach programs and to provide for the faculty and students in these programs the support services necessary for effective teaching and learning. These outreach programs and satellite campuses that fan out from the central core to the remotest reaches of a district or state served by community colleges run into the hundreds for a multicollege district; from 20 to 50 for most colleges. A college that is not actively expanding in this direction is considered derelict in its responsibilities to the community. Today, taking education to the community is considered the hallmark of the two-year college.

Much of the credit for the establishment of the noncampus colleges goes to the leaders of the districts or colleges--the chief administrators assisted by a few central office administrators. Faculty and campus administrators have had little or no part in the planning stages of the noncampus colleges. What influence they have exerted has come after the fact rather than before. This is patently true in the founding of Whatcom Community College and the Community College of Vermont which started as noncampus colleges before any faculty were

selected. In the multicollege districts the evidence for the predominant influence of the district staff, particularly the chancellor or chief administrator may be derived directly from the official reports issued before and after the establishment of the colleges and indirectly from the resistance and lukewarm support from the faculty and campus administrators.

In area served the noncampus colleges vary from the 92 square miles for Coastline Community College to the 9600 square miles for the Community College of Vermont. By population the variation is from 85,000 for Whatcom Community College to almost 4 million for the Los Angeles Office for New Dimensions.

The single-member noncampus colleges, Whatcom Community College and the Community College of Vermont, chose to organize without a large central campus and to conduct classes in locations throughout their respective jurisdictions. Three of the noncampus colleges in multicollege districts (Chicago City-Wide College, Coastline Community College and Pioneer Community College) are conglomerates of activities and functions formerly conducted by the campus colleges and by the central administration plus a few new functions and activities that transcend campus jurisdictions. The nuclei of each of these conglomerates are the off-campus branches spun off from the campus colleges. While Coastline and Pioneer have complete jurisdiction over the transferred activities and function, the Chicago City-Wide College "does not offer programs in its own right....It manages programs that are offered on the premises of the other eight colleges and in other locations throughout the city" (Grede, 1976a). The roles of two, the Office for New Dimensions and Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study are more circumscribed. The Chicago Urban Skills Center has jurisdiction over "below-college-level" postsecondary education.

The eight noncampus institutions discussed in this paper may be classified on the basis of their responsibilities:

A. Responsible for all educational activities

1. Community College of Vermont
2. Whatcom Community College

B. Responsible for all off-campus educational activities

3. Coastline Community College--includes television
4. Pioneer Community College

C. Responsible for limited or special educational activities

5. Chicago City-Wide College--manages off-campus programs for district colleges, administers Overseas and Television Programs
6. Office for New Dimensions--District-wide off-campus programs, Overseas and Television Programs
7. Peralta College for Non-Traditional Studies--role not defined
8. Chicago Urban Skills Institute--all adult education activities transferred from the Chicago Public School system and a campus-based Skill Center funded under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

Since this report was prepared information was received on another noncampus college, Community Campus of the Pima County Community College District in Arizona. Community Campus has an enrollment of 7,000, 55 outreach posts, and 400 part-time instructors (Spector, 1976; also see Pima County Community College District, 1976).

All the campuses have a central headquarters for administrative and support personnel; production, research and developmental activities; secretarial services for administration, instruction and student services; TV studios and media centers; equipment and supplies; plus others. At these headquarters the buildings are usually college-owned or leased for long terms. Regional or area centers are common in most colleges. They are smaller versions of the main headquarters, with primary responsibility for coordinating and supervising the educational and counseling activities in the region.

In all institutions the emphasis is on many learning centers designed "to reduce or eliminate the geographic, social, financial,

academic and other barriers to access...by bringing instruction into the various communities...[to] make day classes and summer classes as accessible as evening classes to students in scattered communities..." (Whatcom Community College, 1972, p. 1). These off-campus facilities may be located in the community or abroad where the students may pursue their learning--veterans hospital, golf course, library, elementary or high school or university classroom, senior citizens' home, office or factory, lunchroom, Indian reservation, prison, military base. They may be borrowed or rented for a day or a week or leased for an indefinite period of time. At some locations college-owned mobile units or relocatable buildings are used.

The noncampus colleges accept the dicta of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study that the needs of students rather than the convenience of institutions must receive top priority; that diversity and individual opportunity must be paramount; that uniform prescription must be kept at the absolute minimum; that time, space, and course requirements must be deemphasized in favor of competence and where applicable, performance; and that age must not be a barrier to learning (Tapper, 1976). All provide opportunity for evaluation of experiential learning.

The purposes of the noncampus colleges do not differ materially from those of campus colleges, except for the emphasis they place on being nontraditional. Within the scope of their jurisdiction the noncampus colleges serve the needs of students in the academic, vocational-technical, basic adult and remedial educational areas. They also offer noncredit classes and a wide range of community services activities.

The Community College of Vermont and Whatcom Community College are more like campus colleges than are the noncampus colleges in multicollege districts. They have responsibility for serving the needs of all the students within their boundaries. The other noncampus colleges are restricted in the kind of students they serve and the functions they perform. They are precluded from serving the normal

college-going day student. They have fewer two-year programs leading to the associate degree either for the academic or technical-vocational student. However, they have been given jurisdiction over other activities, being in a sense catchall organizations to which are assigned or transferred activities formerly conducted through the district office. Often, the noncampus colleges cooperate with campus colleges and sometimes coordinate activities of two or more campuses. Under the umbrella are brought activities such as instructional television, overseas campuses, evaluation of student learning experiences in terms of traditional credits, staff development, educational research, screening applicants for Job Corps assignments.

It is noteworthy that four of the six institutions in multicollege districts are named to indicate their broadened functions. The new names, City-Wide College, College for Non-Traditional Study, New Dimensions, Urban Skills Institute, were selected because they describe various characteristics and roles that distinguish these institutions from campus colleges. Obviously, "college" would have been inappropriate for the Chicago Urban Skills Institute. "Community College" would not be descriptive of those colleges with overseas programs and/or programs, such as staff development for other colleges, that heretofore were considered beyond the purview of a community college. The Commission on New Dimensions reported that:

> "New Dimensions embody the idea of 'horizontal coverage,' a strategy to serve the total District area--in contrast to 'vertical coverage,' such as the individual campus with a smaller, more circumscribed territory....The New Dimensions would provide programs too costly to duplicate or not available through existing campuses, without in any way supplanting or usurping current college responsibilities. Many activities presently coordinated by the District office would conceivably move into the New Dimensions with an organizational structure that would be conducive to innovative program planning, promotion and evaluation on a District-wide basis" (Erickson, 1976, p. 7).

A similar reason lay behind the naming of Chicago City-Wide College whose "campus is the entire Community College District No. 508 of the State of Illinois which is coterminus with the boundaries of the City of Chicago" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, p. 1).

There are significant differences between the noncampus colleges and colleges without walls patterned after the Open University of England. In general, colleges without walls do not conduct classes although they may grant credit for course work at recognized institutions and they may require students to attend periodic meetings. The noncampus colleges lean heavily on classroom-instructor learning, although they offer alternative nonclassroom-learning options. Also, while credits and degrees receive major emphasis at the colleges without walls, they seem to be downplayed at the noncampus colleges. Many of the students at noncampus colleges do not desire degrees, others already have baccalaureates and advanced degrees, and a very large number attend non-credit classes for recreation, personal enrichment and upgrading skills.

How many noncampus colleges will be established is difficult to guess. Many administrators with a large number of off-campus classes are following the progress of the new noncampus colleges in anticipation of establishing similar organizations, either as independent campuses or as subordinate units. Much will depend on the success of the new colleges in fulfilling the promises that are being made.

As outreach centers multiply, as the distance from the central headquarters grows, as functions multiply and as enrollments increase specialized noncampus institutions may develop in the larger districts. The Chicago City Colleges system has already pointed in this direction with its two noncampus institutions, one for adults below the college level and the other for college level adults. Equally logical would be a noncampus college for the district off-campus classes and a noncampus college comprising activities conducted under contract for the military and custodial agencies.

Although the multicollege districts are the most likely places where new noncampus colleges will emerge, some will start in areas that heretofore have not had a community college. Most of these will arise in response to the needs of people in sparsely settled areas. Illustrative are three proposals for regional, statewide and national noncampus colleges. An assessment report on the occupational needs for four counties comprising the Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland proposed a community college without walls which would utilize existing facilities in the area rather than set up its own centers. The proposed Lower Shore Community College would not offer courses but would act as a coordinating and administrative body with power to contract for services with existing institutions (Maner, 1975). Another proposal, for a State of Maine Community College Delivery System (without walls), recommended making use of available postsecondary facilities and the business and industrial community in developing associate degree programs concentrating on vocational technical education (Pressley, 1973). A third plan by Puerto Rican Research and Resources Center for a noncampus community college provided for the establishment of learning centers in Puerto Rican areas in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Puerto Rico. Later, the coordinating agency became a university, Universidad Boricua, with the same general objectives but encompassing work leading to high school equivalency certificates and associate in arts and bachelor of arts degrees (Alicea and Schaefer, 1973).

Summary

The noncampus colleges have not been formed from the same mold. The amalgam of traditional and nontraditional elements is producing colleges of various mixes with the former predominant in most. Some colleges are still in a rudimentary state. There are differences between the independent colleges and those in multicollege districts and among the colleges in each group. Their organizations, functions, operational plans are still in the developing stage, tentative, subject to revision as experience and expediency makes necessary.

LOCATIONS AND FACILITIES

Noncampus colleges operate in a large number of locations and conduct classes in a considerably larger number of facilities. Some are close to the central headquarters; other miles away--in a few instances several thousand miles away in foreign countries. At each location, called a learning center or outreach post, there may be one class for a specific purpose for a definite period of time or many classes for a variety of purposes continued for an indefinite period of time. The objective is to have one of these learning centers within reach of every inhabitant of the District--within each square mile for Coastline Community College (Luskin, 1976a); within each zip code area for the Chicago City-Wide College (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c). The noncampus colleges located in areas of low population density must accomplish the same purpose by moving locations periodically or by other means.

The number of locations vary from 20 to 500. During 1973-74 Whatcom Community College rented or borrowed for classroom and other uses 154 kinds of facilities in 49 different locations. The kinds of facilities and the percentage of each kind were:

schools	23%
churches	12%
public agencies	12%
private agencies YMCA, YWCA, Lynden Community Center, Tillicum House-Ferndale State Street workshop, Lummi Tribal Center, etc.	19%
Business or industry (includes hospitals)	32%
private residence	2%

(Whatcom Community College, 1974a, p. 2)

Coastline Community College (1976a) in its Schedule of Classes for 1976-77 lists nearly 100 addresses of off-campus locations.

In general they are similar to the kind used by Whatcom except for the addition of private dance studio, bowling lanes, ice capades chalet, and the college's administrative center. The College also offers 8 courses by television and one course by newspaper. In 1975 the Chicago City-Wide College offered classes in 127 private and 183 public facilities similar to those used by Whatcom and Coastline Community Colleges (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c). Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study used 20 locations including the University of California at Berkeley with which it conducts a UC/Peralta Experimental Program. The college offers more than 50 classes in 45 subjects (Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study, 1976).

Colleges also offer courses on military bases and Indian reservations, and in prisons and hospitals within their districts. The Overseas Program of the Office for New Dimensions in 1976 consists of 42 locations in the Far East, Iceland, and in parts of the United States outside District boundaries (Los Angeles Community College District, 1976b). Equally widespread are the locations of the Overseas Program of the Chicago City-Wide College that extend from Oslo, Norway, to Ankara, Turkey. TV courses via cassettes are provided at remote military locations (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c). Both institutions offer classes on Navy ships and bases.

In locations with large populations one or more of the local sites may become subcampuses with permanent buildings. In fact, the Whatcom trustees anticipated that subcampuses would develop in some locations. The most likely locations are those where classes are held in or near the central and regional headquarters building. While not permanent the learning centers on military bases and on Indian reservations are, in fact, subcampuses. On the military bases the offerings of courses and programs are as extensive as those on state-side campus colleges (Los Angeles Community Colleges Overseas, 1976). Where a large program is conducted through television the unit supervising the program, TV College in Chicago for example, may also

be classified as a subcampus as may the Dawson Skill Center of the Chicago Urban Skills Institute which conducts a large federally funded job training program in a permanent building.

Servicing the faculty and students at these outreach units has been a major concern of the campus administrators. In a preliminary survey of faculty in the outpost locations the Coastline Community College staff found that because of the absence of material services there was "a heavy reliance on personal equipment, instructional materials, and teaching aids" (Coastline Community College, 1976b, p. 25). For the Community College of Vermont "resource accessibility not adequacy, [is] the most serious problem" (Community College of Vermont, 1975c, p. 66).

Most colleges have devised a production and delivery system to provide the teaching staff and students with the materials and services they need. A few use the regional offices for this purpose; others have central production and distribution stations; mail service is also used. The production and delivery services may include "library materials, human resources, tools, and laboratory equipment, audio-visual materials and equipment, materials purchased by the student, special equipment required for a specialized area of study" (Community College of Vermont, 1975c, p. 52).

In the Chicago system an Instruction and Faculty Development Center will serve the Chicago City-Wide College, as well as the other colleges, in producing the software needed. The Community College of Vermont has a print and visual media service for instructors and students (Community College of Vermont, 1973). Coastline will organize an instructional materials center to serve the faculty and develop a delivery, set-up and maintenance services for off-campus sites (Coastline Community College, 1976). All of the colleges have mobile units for delivering textbooks and supplies, library equipment and sometimes a complete classroom facility. Whatcom Community College operates a twice-daily (occasionally thrice-daily) delivery service between instructional centers and classrooms, carrying needed supplies

and equipment (Mahlberg, 1976). In multicampus districts the noncampus colleges may be served by district centers (Chicago City Colleges, 1975).

Library service is arranged with public libraries and, in multi-college districts, with the campus libraries. In many communities the library is the site for one or more of the off-campus classes. For centers with large concentration of students library service may be provided through a mobile unit or by a selected collection of books and periodicals located in a room. Interlibrary loans and special services such as Books-By-Mail help in the rural areas.

Food services pose a more difficult problem. Arrangements may be made with nearby restaurants or catering carts. In college-owned or leased quarters vending machine service is a possibility. In homes students and faculty often share the costs of providing refreshments during breaks.

LEARNING ACTIVITIES

The learning activities have many facets; but broadly they may be classified as academic courses which have a content, a time element and an assessment at the end of the period and the community service or community education activities which may be of one-hour duration or of a term comparable to the traditional courses but without an assessment translated into grades and credits. It is not always clear in the public documents which of the two groups is the more important aspect. Excluding the cultural activities the academic courses attract the greater number but this may be a result of the premium on credit courses for state apportionment. Were parity in funding achieved the number of students in each group would be about equal.

Noncampus colleges offer a variety of learning experiences in their academic courses. Still predominant in terms of enrollment is the classroom or "credit based system" in which students and teacher meet for a specific period, one to five days per week during a term

of fixed duration. The student's grade is the instructor's assessment of the learning achieved. Where state funding patterns are based on student attendance the instructor is not free to award a grade before the end of the term.

In the alternative learning experiences the emphasis is on competence, giving recognition for what a "student knows and can do...regardless of where the student learned it or how long it took." The student participates in the assessment of the competence achieved (Community College of Vermont, 1975b, p. A4). These experiences are expected to encourage "the student in self-directed pursuit of learning" (Whatcom Community College, 1976b, p. 51).

Illustrative of alternative learning experiences are those offered by Whatcom Community College: Military Service; Evaluation Prior Learning Experience; Course Challenge/CLEP (College Level Examination Program); Individual Learning Program; On Your Own; Multi Occupational Program; Cooperative Occupation Program; and Community Involvement Program (Whatcom Community College, 1976b).

Under the first three alternatives a student may earn or be given credit for military service, for prior experiential learning or life experiences or by successfully challenging a course, passing a college designed examination or a CLEP examination. The next two of the alternatives are individually designed programs, one involving individualized learning outside the classroom, the other involving a cooperative arrangement with the college or community library. The last three of the alternatives are variations of work (paid or volunteer) experience and college study. The Multi Occupational Program is an on-the-job training program in which the student arranges for the job; the Cooperative Education Program integrates academic work with a job arranged by the College; while in the Community Involvement Program the student works as a volunteer in an agency, such as a school district, Red Cross, Crisis Clinic, etc. In each of the eight alternatives the student has the help of the college's alternative learning experiences facilitator (Whatcom Community College, 1976b).

In addition to these eight programs Whatcom designs all its mathematics classes for individualized, instructor directed learning in a laboratory environment (Whatcom Community College, 1976d).

Other colleges offer alternative learning experiences through instructional television, educational telephone network, correspondence, tutoring, newspapers, cassettes, and other media that lend themselves to individual study.

The Community College of Vermont substitutes for units or credits a Contract-to-Complete plan in which a student writes learning plans, identifies goals based on program guidelines, and documents the learning in terms of specific objectives. Throughout the process the student works with a counselor and members of the Regional Review Board composed of students, teachers and professionals from the community. Initial review and final approval is the responsibility of the Regional Review Board. A College-wide Review Board assures consistency throughout the system (Community College of Vermont, 1973).

The student is advised that he/she may combine in his/her study plan "Regular Courses; Past Experience Assessment; Independent Study; On-the-Job Training; Practicum, Courses and Workshops at Other Places; Correspondence Courses and Home Study Kits and CLEP Tests; and any other alternative experience "as long as you can demonstrate what you know and can do" (Community College of Vermont, 1975b, p. A7). Units or credits are not given unless a student needs them for transfer or employment. Although degrees are granted counselors and administrators are instructed not to overemphasize that aspect of the Community College of Vermont (Vermont Community Colleges, 1973).

Very similar, if not identical, to the CCV's pattern, is President Tapper's proposal for Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study (PCNS). The PCNS plan substitutes "sets of educational outcomes in sequences leading to a specified degree [for] a curriculum in terms of courses and course content." Faculty acting as facilitators will help students reach their goals; but "the way in which these outcomes are achieved, the manner in which those achievements are demonstrated,

the length of time to reach the objectives, would all be left to the individual student" (Tapper, 1976, pp. 22-23). Three levels are proposed. At Level I "all students might have the same desired outcomes (a common learning contract)...at Level II there might be four possibilities and at Level III twenty, the choice depending on the educational objectives of the student" (Tapper, 1976, p. 22).

The Chicago Urban Skills Institute has an office for Special Programs for experimenting with alternative nontraditional methods and delivery systems. Among its alternative programs are an Adult Alternative High School to create in adults a "self-perception...as a creator of one's own destiny" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b, p. 33) and PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Objective) with 16 terminals connected with the Master Computer at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. Lessons are available in Accounting, English, Mathematics, Math-Drafting and others (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b).

Some nontraditional programs retain many of the elements common in traditional programs. In a joint arrangement the Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study and the University of California, Berkeley offer about 13 classes a semester to approximately 140 minority students and older adults, some of whom work on the Berkeley campus. The classes are small and are staffed by graduate students who "are encouraged to individualize their material and methods to as great a degree as feasible" (Tapper, 1976, p. 8). Courses offered include Anthropology, Black Studies, English, Management and Supervision, Nutrition, Psychology, Spanish (Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study, 1976). The program is funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

A probable development is for the noncampus college in a multi-college district to be given the responsiblity for evaluating and awarding credit for all experiential learning. The Chicago City-Wide College administers the CLEP examination for the entire City Colleges system, is the testing center for the National Occupational Testing Institute, and operates the College Acceleration Program in the Chicago

area high schools for students who seek early entry in the community and senior colleges (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c).

Data on enrollments in the alternatives are spotty. Whatcom Community College reported that 100 students had taken advantage of one or more of its alternatives. This number perhaps is conservative considering that all mathematics classes are designed for individualized instruction. Most colleges report granting credit for military service but numbers are not available. As the veteran enrollment declines this alternative will cease to have significance. Enrollments in cooperative education classes that fluctuate with the economic situation tend to be large in some colleges; in Los Angeles it is expected to average about 5,400 a semester (Cherdack, 1976). At the Chicago Urban Skills Institute approximately 250 students per week made use of PLATO (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b).

Among the other alternatives instructional television is the most popular in terms of students enrolled. In the Fall 1975 semester Chicago City-Wide College enrolled 429 for credit in the TV College (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c); Los Angeles Community College District (1976d) enrolled 2,560; and Coast Community College District enrolled 6,400 (Coastline Community College, 1976b).

Although every noncampus college offers CLEP as an alternative, figures are not available. However, judging by a report on "CLEP Exemption Testing Results" it is widely used in the Chicago community colleges. From September 1970 through March 1974, 4,351 students passed from one to four exams or from 6 to 24 credit hours. In 1973 the last full year reported, 1,437 students, representing 52 percent of those taking the examinations, earned credit through CLEP (Master Plan for the City Colleges of Chicago, 1974). This program is now a responsibility of the Chicago City-Wide College. The Community College of Vermont has undertaken the responsibility to set up centers in various communities for the administration of the CLEP examinations (Community College of Vermont, 1975c).

Alternative learning experiences while available at all colleges are restricted by various external and college policies. For benefits under various GI Bills the Veterans Administration does not accept credit awarded for military experience or by course challenge, CLEP or evaluation of prior experiential learning (Whatcom Community College, 1976e). Refusal by state colleges and universities to accept CLEP and other experiential-type credits for transfer also has inhibiting effects on their use (Keim, 1976a; Coastline Community College, 1976a). Nearly all the colleges have rules limiting the total number of units acceptable for graduation and the number that may be earned under each type of alternative. This Chicago City-Wide College will recognize "non-traditional activity...only after a student has chosen a program of study at the City Colleges and only in conjunction with such program of study" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, p. 25). The maximum for cooperative work experience is 6 units and for CLEP 48 units. However, students may earn a degree entirely by TV courses. Whatcom Community College limits are a maximum of 15 quarter credits for military training, 45 credits for CLEP general examinations and 65 credits for CLEP subject examinations. Since 90 quarter credits are required for graduation a student could still earn all of his credits through alternative learning experiences (Whatcom Community College, 1976b). At Coastline Community College not more than 16 units distributed equally in four areas, Humanities, Mathematics, Social Science, Natural Science, may be applied toward an Associate in Arts degree. Similar limits are placed on credits earned through other alternative learning experiences.

For the student who does not want a degree or a certificate in a technical-vocational program the restrictions on credits earned through alternative learning experiences are not serious. For the student who plans to transfer, particularly to a professional school, law, medicine or engineering for example, the alternatives are not of great benefit. Warnings in schedules of classes that:

> "Credit granted on the basis of CLEP does not transfer to other colleges. Students planning to use CLEP credit for college transfer purposes will need to consult the transfer institution regarding their policy pertaining to the CLEP program"(Coastline Community College, 1976a, p. 6)

are not encouraging. Neither does the college encourage students to earn "Credit by Examination" or by "CR-NCR" (Credit-Non-Credit) options by identifying them on the transcript as such, a practice similar to placing an "X" before a course to identify it as an evening or extension division course, presumably not comparable to a course taken during the day session.

In answer to the question "Why has Pioneer Community College adopted the traditional format in its educational offerings and delivery systems," President Keim answered that the College "began...with a rather traditional format for good reasons. (Perhaps a district without other colleges would begin in some other manner.)" He listed four reasons:

> "a. We wanted to emphasize a continuity of quality and use, as part-time instructors, present faculty members from the campus colleges.
>
> b. We did not want to appear <u>too</u> innovative or too non-traditional.
>
> c. We needed time to train teachers in competency-based instruction.
>
> d. We were on a minimum budget so as not to upset the other schools. (We are still on a bare bones fiscal system.)"

He also mentioned that "the University of Missouri does not recognize CLEP at all..." (Keim, 1976a).

In California (and in other states) "any forward looking concept which would apply a system of competency-based learning credits would run counter to the apportionment system...based on student attendance..." (California Community Colleges, 1976, p. 20).

Summary

It seems that no matter how confident the noncampus administrators are in their public relations statements about changing society through nontraditional or alternative learning experiences they have not yet made spectacular progress in changing the community's attitude toward nontraditional education. As a consequence they must stick closely to the traditional patterns in their offerings and in their practices of identifying student learning on transcripts. Until outside educational and noneducational institutions are converted to the validity of alternative learning experiences the noncampus colleges will probably experiment within a narrow range of such activities.

ORGANIZATION

The noncampus institutions try to be as nontraditional in their administrative organizations as in their learning strategies. They have adapted the traditional forms to their method of operations and to the varied functions that they have been assigned. The department/division unit, so prominent in campus colleges is absent or plays a minor role. Except for Whatcom, the noncampus colleges have also dispensed with student activities. Several have organized geographical subdivisions, called field sites at Vermont, instructional centers at Whatcom, regional areas at Chicago Urban Skills Institute, and program areas at Coastline. Subdivisions based on educational functions or services have been developed by the Chicago institutions, the Office for New Dimensions, Coastline, and Pioneer.

For the most part the organizations are less nontraditional in the support services than in the delivery services. At the central headquarters the patterns are much like those of campus colleges. Depending on size there is the President's office with assistants in public relations and other activities, two to four major divisions, administrative services, instructional or learning services, student

support services, business affairs.

Of the two independent colleges Whatcom adheres closely to conventional campus patterns while the Community College of Vermont deviates markedly. It may have been easier for CCV to do so, since it has been experimental from the beginning, has had no competitors in its area and until 1974 received much of its funds from nonpublic sources. Whatcom has had to contend with long-established state funding formulas and could be compared to a dozen well-established colleges. The Community College of Vermont has not only deviated farthest from the conventional patterns but has also developed the simplest structure. Among the colleges in multicampus districts Coastline and Pioneer have followed conventional patterns more closely than the other colleges.

In the following sections some of the organizational patterns evolving will be described. Evolving is used advisedly since the organizations are not fixed. Moreover, the organizational patterns range from the well-defined to the rudimentary.

Organizational Patterns

Whatcom Community College has three divisions: General Administration, College Support Services and Instruction, and Instructional Support Services. Under College Support Services are the business, noneducational services, while all the activities relating to instruction, admission, student personnel, library, etc. are under Instructional Support Services. The College maintains four instructional centers for counseling and advising, registration, faculty/student conferences, and support services.

The Chicago Urban Skills Institute has two major and several minor subdivisions. Its Dawson Skill Center and Adult Learning Skills Program are practically two separate organizations, the former a day school operating on a fixed campus site for 30-40 hours per week for students funded under C.E.T.A. (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) and the latter operating in the city high schools and several hundred outreach sites mainly in the evening, for part-time

students. The one is primarily vocational and the other comprehensive in scope. Two other components of the Institute are the Job Corps, a recruiting program for the Department of Labor and St. Mary's Alternative Experimental Program for high school dropouts. The Adult Learning Skills Program has 10 regional directors as well as a supervisor in each school in which it conducts programs. In addition there is the usual complement of service units--business and operational services, grants and personnel, registration, financial aids, community relations and the like (Chicago City Colleges, 1976a).

A common basis for grouping related activities is by programs. Pioneer has three subdivisions under Instructional Systems and Student Development: Individual Development Center, Cooperative Programs Center, and Developmental Studies Center. The Office for New Dimensions will have four institutes--Overseas Programs, Individual Programs, Cooperative Programs, and Community Programs. Chicago bases its groupings on the type of orientation-discipline and clientele oriented for its traditional collegiate programs; delivery system oriented for its open learning or nontraditional programs; clientele oriented for its college acceleration and overseas programs; and 3-dimensional oriented for its continuing education-community services division. Coastline Community College has an Emeritus Institute and Telecourse Design, besides its other divisions of Instruction, Students and Community Services, Admission and Records, and Business.

Except at Whatcom functions associated with extra-curricular activities are subordinated or combined with the community services or instructional unit. The extra-curricular activities, weak on the campus colleges, have even less acceptance on noncampus colleges catering to mature adults. Student government, proms, and athletics are replaced by classes in dancing, individual and small group sports, lectures, crafts, and other leisure activities. Since the noncampus college is community-based it seems logical to the administrators to consider them as the extra-curricular activities for its clientele. Thus, Coastline Community College combined community services and

student services because in a noncampus college they are overlapping functions rather than distinct services as in traditional colleges. "The traditional student activities...will be replaced by community service activities which will involve...students as community residents" (Coastline Community College, 1976b, pp. 30-31). At Pioneer Community College student services is part of the Instructional Systems and Student Development unit. The major student personnel services are counseling and guidance, testing and health services. In the functional responsibilities of the dean (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1976d) no mention is made of student or extra-curricular activities.

Neither of the Chicago institutions, or the Los Angeles Office for New Dimensions has an organization or staff for such student activities, although each offers a wide variety of community services activities and programs which might qualify as extra-curricular activities. At the Community College of Vermont a student committee was formed in the Spring of 1975 to consider the formation of a student government organization (Community College of Vermont, 1975c).

In 1975 under the Director of Student Services Whatcom Community College initiated an experiment in student government led by a Student Organization Team, S.O.T. (Whatcom Community College, 1976e). The names of students to serve on S.O.T. are drawn by lot from a list of all students attending the College. Since organizing, students have acquired representation on the Board of Trustees and on college committees, compiled a Student Handbook, and issued a newsletter. By arrangement students have access to the programs and activities of Washington State College. For the 1976/1977 year S.O.T. plans to develop policies on grievance, rights and responsibilities, meet student needs in child care, transportation and creative expression and place more students on college teams (Whatcom Community College, 1976b).

The institutions vary in their nomenclature for the administrative officers. The chief executive is called president in all institutions except the Office for New Dimensions where he is called director. Each of the two Chicago institutions has a vice president. The next

echelon administrators are called deans, except at the Chicago Urban Skills Institute and the Community College of Vermont where the title is director. The number of deans or directors varies from one to five.

"Director" seems to be a popular designation and may represent in the same institution the chief executive or a second, third or fourth echelon administrator. Confusion about relative rankings is avoided by adding "executive" to the superordinate administrator's title or "regional" to the subordinate administrator's.

Responsibility for maintaining communication between the central office and the part-time faculty and the agency providing the facility is assigned to the director or coordinator of the field site, area or instructional center. Sometimes, this administrator also has supervision of counseling, registration and instructional activities in the area. The field site director in the Vermont organization has broad responsibilities for the administrative and educational program in the location while at Coastline each program director has responsibility for a comprehensive program development in the area. Where geographical subdivisions have not been organized responsibility is assigned to a central office administrator.

Deviating from the line and staff organizational pattern is the organization of the Community College of Vermont, where a new reallocation of authority has been achieved in line with President Peter P. Smith's belief that "When one talks about non-traditional colleges, one must be talking not only about the kind of education that is delivered, but also about the way the college is organized for its operation." Moreover he contends that unless the "internal structure is changed to support the new delivery systems...a new, distinct kind of educational service is unlikely to be transmitted from that organization to the consumer. Structure and service go hand in hand" (1976, p. 69).

The organizational pattern consists of a central staff of about 12 and regional staffs of about 13 at three sites or offices. "Common understanding of accepted decision making and decision implementing"

between the central staff and each regional site is achieved through a handbook that acts as a manual enabling "any member of the staff to initiate action to solve a problem he has or sees in the organization." Planning is done by each team. The president does not get involved until the all-college plan and budget developed by the directors is presented to him since he feels that "It is more reasonable to manage and organize a physically dispersed system such as a noncampus college through shared authority than to have centralized authority" (Smith, 1976, p. 75).

Summary

Of the organizational developments three are worthy of special notice. These are responses to the changed conditions of administering the widely scattered learning units.

One is the subordination or elimination of the department/division as a unit in the administrative organization. In most of the descriptions there is hardly a mention of this unit which plays so important a role in the campus colleges. Its absence seems to be accepted as a natural development under the teaching conditions of the noncampus learning locations. There is no need for the organization or the leadership where the number of individuals teaching in a discipline at any place is one or at the most two or three.

A second organizational change, that may be considered a replacement for the department/division, is the geographical subadministrative units or/and the functional units. The geographical units variously called sites, instructional centers or program areas headed by field site directors, facilitators or program directors respectively, serve as focal points for the personnel and clientele in the outreach programs, as the distribution centers for material services to the students and faculty, as liaison with the central headquarters, and as symbols of the college for the community. The functional units, frequently called programs, institutes or services are common in the larger colleges. Illustrative units are overseas programs, individual programs, cooperative programs, emeriti institute and open learning services institute.

Each of these units is usually headed by a high level administrator with considerable responsibility.

The third change is the absence of the traditional student government and extra-curricular activities at the noncampus colleges in multicampus districts. At these colleges the student personnel department has become an adjunct of the community services division. At Whatcom one of two independent colleges, student governments have been formed and at Vermont the other independent college, a student committee was chosen to consider the organization of a student government. However, both colleges also depend on local activities to serve the extra-curricular needs of its students.

FINANCING

Sources of Funds

In general, noncampus colleges are financed in the same manner as campus colleges in the same state or district. The principal sources are local taxes, state subventions, tuition and fees, federal aid, foundation grants, in-kind contributions, and income from private and public agencies for services, the bookstore, food services and other activities (Table 1).

The institutions receive from 23 percent to 80 percent of their funds from the State, with those that have no local taxing authority, receiving the highest proportion--64 percent for Community College of Vermont and 80 percent for Whatcom Community College. The other six obtain from 27 percent to more than 50 percent of their funds from local taxes, those charging tuition obtaining less than those not charging tuition. Four of the institutions charge tuition and fees; the three California colleges and the Chicago Urban Skills Institute do not, except for nominal charges. Tuition generates from 10 percent to 29 percent of the income. The overseas programs of the Chicago City-Wide College and the Office for New Dimensions are self-supporting, deriving all of their funds from tuition and some in-kind help from

the military agencies.

All colleges receive federal aid in some form; for operating overseas programs, for vocational-technical courses and programs, for overhead costs in the administration of financial aid and veterans benefits. The amount varies widely, under normal circumstances the percentage is between 3 percent and 10 percent.

From time to time colleges obtain large federal and foundation grants. In 1975, Whatcom received a grant of $50,000 per year for three years from the Kellogg Foundation (Whatcom Community College, 1975). The Dawson Skill Center of the Chicago Urban Skills Institute receives 70 percent of its revenues from the federal government (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b); and half of the Chicago City-Wide funds are derived from contracts and special programs.

Until 1974-75 the Community College of Vermont received a large proportion of its funds from federal and foundation sources. Beginning with the 1975-76 fiscal year the College has been making the difficult transition from soft money (federal grants) to hard money (state appropriations and tuition). State appropriations which comprised 23 percent of the 1974-75 budget jumped to 64 percent the next year; tuition from 9 percent to 29 percent; while federal funds and other grants tumbled from 68 percent to 8 percent (Community College of Vermont, 1975a). During the 1976-77 budget sessions the Legislature almost voted to cut off all funds. The budget was cut by $50,000 (Wade and Smith, 1976).

TABLE 1
SOURCES OF FUNDS

	State Subventions	Local Taxes	Tuition & Fees	Federal Aid	Other	Remarks
Chicago City-Wide College[a]	←50 percent→		(2)	←50 percent→		1976-77
Chicago Urban Skills Institute[b]						
Dawson Skill Center	30			70		1975-76
Adult Learning Skills	←Varies from year to year→					
Community College of Vermont[c]	23	--	9	36	32	1974-75
	64	--	29	←8→		1975-76
Coastline Community College[d]	43	47	(1)	6	5	District 1976-77
Office for New Dimensions[e]	25	68	(1,2)	3	4	District-wide 1976-77
Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study[f]	51	44	(1)	2	3	District 1976-77
Pioneer Community College[g]	42	27	23	6	2	District-wide 1975-76
Whatcom Community College[h]	80	--	10	5	4	1974-75

Note: (1) Tuition for nonresidents and small fees for residents are charged but these are a very small fraction of the total.
(2) In the Overseas Programs tuition is the major source of funds. No district funds are allocated.

Sources: [a]Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, p. 59.
[b]Chicago City Colleges, 1976b, p. 54.
[c]Community College of Vermont, 1975a, p. 11.
[d]Thompson, 1977.
[e]Los Angeles Community College District, 1976a, Part I, p. 2.
[f]Hancock, 1977.
[g]Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1976c, p. 3.
[h]Whatcom Community College, 1974a, p. 1.

Expenditures

One of the advantages often cited for the noncampus over the campus college is the cost benefit to be derived from the use of existing facilities rather than permanent structures on fixed sites and from the employment of part-time instead of full-time instructors.

Two years before the Whatcom Community College opened the Board of Trustees envisioned "a shared approach between the community college, industry, education and other segments of the community..." (Whatcom Community College, 1974c, p. 1). When the college opened it rented and borrowed facilities from Grange and fire halls, private homes and public buildings. A state-owned relocatable building placed on land leased from a local high school district for $1.00 a year became the College's Service Center Building (Whatcom Community College, 1974c). Coastline Community College estimated the saving to the district in construction at $40 million (Luskin, 1976a). In Vermont in 1973 the rate per square foot for academic facilities was $45; a figure that was expected to more than double by 1980. In the light of this cost and the Vermont higher education debt service of $2.1 million annually, the Community College of Vermont staff questioned "whether it would be wise for the State of Vermont to invest major sums in the 'bricks and mortar' of higher education in the future unless absolutely necessary" (Parker and Vecchitto, 1973, p. 33). From the beginning the Community College of Vermont has worked "continuously to preserve its 'no cost' relationship to the scores of public and private facilities with which it collaborates to offer learning sites" (Community College of Vermont, 1975c, p. 17). In 1975 the College estimated that it saved $100,000 by donations of classroom and office space (Community College of Vermont, 1975c).

Counterbalancing savings in capital outlay are extra expenses incurred by operating in nonpermanent buildings scattered over a large area. For example, costs for travel by personnel and for delivery of various services to the learning centers are "inordinately high as compared to conventional operating modes" (Whatcom Community

College, 1972, p. 5).

For the multicollege districts the saving in capital outlay is not the controlling factor in the decision to create a noncampus college since the campus colleges already operate a large number of off-campus units. Capital outlay costs for off-campus sites are low whether conducted by a campus college or by a noncampus college. In fact it could be argued that the cost of the central and regional administration buildings for the noncampus college increases capital outlay expenses. The noncampus college does help keep district costs down if it takes care of increased demands for education thereby removing the pressure for a new campus college.

Limited savings are also possible where administrators enter into cost-plus contracts with private and public agencies to conduct training programs of various kinds and where they receive in-kind services such as technical advice, voluntary non-paid instructional and counseling services, and contributions of cooperating agencies, business, television and radio stations.

For current operations much larger savings come from the practice of staffing classes with part-time instructors whose salaries and fringe benefits are from 25 to 50 percent lower than those of full-time instructors. For 1973 the Community College of Vermont reported a cost of $450 per course compared to the $750 to $900 cost for a similar course at the Vermont state colleges. This estimate does not include an additional 18 percent in fringe benefits for the full-time state colleges instructors, a cost not incurred for the part-time instructors (Parker and Vecchitto, 1973). An example of the possible savings is illustrated by a comparison of the part-time and full-time salaries at Whatcom Community College. The part-time rate $184 per teaching credit is 73 percent of the lowest entry salary rate ($251); 62 percent of the rate of an instructor with an MA or Equivalent on the fifth step ($298) and 51 percent of the maximum salary ($362).

TABLE 2
WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME SALARY RATES
ON A PER TEACHING CREDIT BASIS

	Part-Time Rate per Teaching Credit	Full-Time Rate per Teaching Credit*	Percent Part-Time of Full-Time Rate (A÷B)
BA or Equivalent	$184	$251 ($11,300÷45)	73
MA + 45 Units	$184	$362 ($16,300÷45)	51
MA or Equivalent	$184 (5th Step)	$298 ($13,400÷45)	62

Note: *The hourly rate for full-time instructors is derived by dividing the annual full-time salary by 45 teaching credits, the average yearly classroom teaching load. Another method of comparison is to multiply the part-time instructor's rate by 45 to get the yearly salary, $8,280.

Source: Adapted from Whatcom Community College, 1976a, pp. 9-10.

How much savings result from the differential in pay has been variously estimated depending upon the size of the college, salary, and the workweek base used. The most extensive studies on this subject have been made in California where a strong movement exists for prorata pay for part-time faculty. Peralta Community College District estimated that for 100 percent prorata the extra cost in 1974-75 over 1973-74 would have been approximately $943,000; at 70 percent prorata it would have been $317,000 (Peralta Community Colleges, 1974).

Again, it is important to point out that for the noncampus colleges that took over existing off-campus operations there is no saving to the district since these operations were already staffed by part-time instructors (See Lombardi, 1975). Also, here too instructional costs will be higher as the noncampus colleges implement the broad programs for staff development, programs often absent for part-time instructors in the off-campus branches of the traditional college. As part-time instructors' salaries and fringe benefits rise

in response to the growing demands for equity the savings will decrease.

Financial savings may increase if the colleges get more students to enroll in alternative learning programs, particularly those involving independent study. So far the number of students in such programs is not large enough to affect per capita cost. Savings are sometimes forced on the noncampus college for strategic reasons as in the case of Pioneer Community College which was placed "on a minimum budget so as not to upset the other schools" (Keim, 1976a).

The evidence on the relative cost of operating a noncampus and a campus college is not conclusive. Moreover, for most of the colleges there are not enough data to make a judgment. On the basis of the data at hand some tentative observations are possible and for Whatcom Community College more definite conclusions may be made.

From the data one may conclude that the Community College of Vermont is operating at a lower per capita cost than would be possible for a campus college offering the same services. The college administrators estimate that a campus college operation would cost at least one-third more than the present noncampus operation (Community College of Vermont, 1975c). On the other hand, the Commission on New Dimensions estimated that the new college would require "$273,000 more over the current budgets for existing programs" supported from general purpose funds. This represented more than 20 percent of the $1,250,000 of general purpose funds (Erickson, 1976, p. 50). Because the Chicago City-Wide College does not offer programs in its own right the revenue generated by students goes to the traditional colleges. Therefore, on the "books at this point the...college is almost a total liability..." (Grede, 1976a). Nevertheless, the administrators estimate that without "the in-kind contribution of cooperating agencies" such as "space, utilities, learning resources, free air time, and instructional resources" its budget "could easily double" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, p. 60).

The data on Whatcom are more definitive. In 1976 McIntyre and Wales of the Research and Planning Office of the Washington State

Board for Community College Education reported in their study of the costs of Whatcom (Community College) Without Campus and Whatcom (a composite of three Washington colleges) With Campus, that for Whatcom Without Campus:

1. Cost per FTE (full-time equivalent student) were higher for each of six categories: Total, Administration, Student Services, Plant Maintenance and Operation, Learning Resources, Instruction;
2. Cost per Course and Cost per Student were lower for each of three categories: Total, Plant Maintenance and Operation, Instruction; and higher for each of three categories: Administration, Student Services, and Learning Resources (McIntyre and Wales, 1976).

McIntyre and Wales point out that "Total" cost per course and cost per student are more favorable to Whatcom Community College because it has a larger percentage (80 percent) of part-time students than the campus college (51 percent) and a larger percentage of part-time faculty, 82 percent to 61 percent. They also call attention to the low capital outlay which more than offsets the high $90,000 cost for leased facilities and rent. Although the $90,000 is eight times the average rental budget for Whatcom With Campus, they "calculate that it would take over a century at $90,000 per year for Whatcom's space costs to equal the estimated $9,970,000 for design and construction of a campus" (McIntyre and Wales, 1976, pp. 25-26).

Based on their research McIntyre and Wales (1976) recommend that state and local governing boards should consider funding colleges on student and course costs rather than on full-time equivalent student costs because the criteria more adequately reflect the costs of serving part-time students. It is more expensive to serve 400 part-time students taking 1 course than 100 students taking 4 courses. They also point out that the new criteria would also benefit campus colleges because they are enrolling more part-time than full-time students. It should also be pointed out that the legislators have not been impressed with this reasoning.

Summary

The sources of funds for the noncampus college are similar to those for the campus colleges. Very little accommodation has been made to the different operating conditions, predominantly part-time student enrollment, and small, widely-separated learning centers. The formulas are based on full-time student enrollment or its equivalent. Because funding patterns are still largely based on class attendance "some non-traditional efforts generate no state aid" (Maricopa Technical Community College, 1976, Part II, p. 12).

The financial difficulties will be compounded as faculty part-time salaries approach those of the full-time salaries and as more part-time instructors attain regular faculty status, with the fringe benefits accruing thereto.

The evidence on the relative cost of education for the noncampus versus the campus college is inconclusive. More studies such as the McIntyre-Wales study on Whatcom are needed.

STUDENTS

Because the common definition of students connotes persons enrolled for credit, the noncampus, as well as, the campus colleges are searching for a new label for the persons they are serving, many of whom are not enrolled for credit or attend non-credit classes and activities. The Commission on New Dimensions noted that in a noncampus college, composed largely of outreach centers, the dividing line between a student and a participant is fuzzy. The same person may be a student enrolled for credit, a participant in a community service activity and a member of an advisory committee (Erickson, 1976). The most commonly used substitute is clientele. A close second is participant. Until agreement is reached on a new term student, clientele, participant are used interchangeably. It is noteworthy that the 1976 Community, Junior and Technical College Directory added to its tables a new column, "Community Education Enrollment" (American Association of Community

and Junior Colleges, 1976). The Illinois Community College Board issues enrollment statistics on "Total Number of Citizens Served in Credit and Non-Credit Classes by Community Colleges" (Illinois Community College Board, 1976, p. 4).

Although stress is placed on student characteristics that differ from those on the campus colleges, the normal college student is still welcome and forms a large part of the enrollment. With few exceptions the special students that the noncampus colleges expect to attract are already found on the campus colleges. In fact, in multicollege districts nearly all of the categories mentioned as special targets for the noncampus colleges are students transferred from the off-campus branches of campus colleges.

A few examples taken from the college literature will give some idea of the clientele or student mix they hope to attract. Pioneer Community College will seek potential students from the less visible groups whom the colleges have not actively sought: "those who cannot afford the time or cost of conventional further education; those whose interest and talents are not served by traditional education; those who have become technologically unemployed and must retool themselves in mid-careers; those whose educational progress has been interrupted by illness, military service, or other temporary conditions; those who are increasingly bored with the routine of highly technological society or faced with leisure time; the older citizens who have come to accept the questionable blessings of early retirement..." (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1975, p. 6).

The college divides its potential student clientele into three broad populations most urgently in need of services: community service population; educationally disadvantaged population; and special needs population. The first group comprise those seeking cultural, avocational, recreational, informational and coordinating services or activities; the second group are the culturally different, motivationally different and academically different; the third group are those with access problems, with special training needs, and with

highly specialized problems, i.e., dropouts, handicapped, parolees, retired persons, public assisted persons, exceptional persons (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1975).

The Office for New Dimensions will appeal to people who are not currently being served by any of the existing colleges. In order not to duplicate programs offered at campus colleges the programs for these students will be those not practical for existing colleges or require coordination or liaison among colleges. Students living outside the district will comprise a large group. Most of them will be in cooperative programs in which the district contracts to perform services in concert with other colleges or agencies or independently. The contracts may be with private firms or with government agencies in this country or with the military services for personnel on bases at home and abroad. The Office for New Dimensions will also have a large student body composed of certificated, administrative and non-certificated employees enrolled in staff development classes, workshops, internships and other related activities. By contract the college will provide such services to employees of nondistrict colleges. It will not have students enrolled in learning centers located within the District boundaries for these will continue to be the responsibility of each campus college (Los Angeles Community College District, 1976b).

Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study hopes to serve the normal college student as well as those who cannot optimally be served by other local academic institutions, those who have already acquired competencies and wish to have them accredited, those who can profit from individual design of learning methods, owners of small businesses who need special help to survive, community health service workers who need to learn new techniques, in general those with special learning objectives (Tapper, 1976). As with the Office for New Dimensions the off-campus classes of the campus colleges have not been transferred to the Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study.

The comprehensive programs and services of Coastline Community College will appeal to an older clientele whose needs tend to be

recurrent and continuing. These people need retraining, personal enrichment, and lifelong learning. Among the target populations will be senior citizens, veterans and women, those who want to learn at home through newspapers and television, and the disabled. Where a district college operates a special program, such as for the deaf, the student will be referred to that college (Coastline Community College, 1976b).

The Chicago Urban Skills Institute has two major aims: to provide "occupational training for the hard-core unemployed and others" and "high school education in the evening and also day and evening GED [General Education Development] and ESL [English as a Second Language] education" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b, p. 5). It does not grant postsecondary degrees but it does award certificates to those completing programs.

The new clienteles of the Chicago City-Wide College will include "the handicapped,...the worker seeking to upgrade his skills" (Chicago City Colleges, 1975, p. 9), personnel in overseas military installations, the high school student who wishes to earn college credits before graduation and the individual who needs certification of learning "acquired through experience, on-the-job training, independent study or course work completed in post-secondary institutions" (Chicago City Colleges, 1975, p. 33). The college has been assigned the responsibility for the education of the deaf, the blind, and the mentally retarded.

A goal that has first priority at the Community College of Vermont is recruitment of low access people, i.e., those with low income, low educational attainment, and those classified as inaccessible geographically (Vermont Community Colleges, 1973).

One of Whatcom's original objectives was to provide in its area "a college for those who do not have college," i.e., those who did not attend Western Washington State College and Bellingham Vocational Technical Institute, the two postsecondary institutions in Whatcom County (McIntyre and Wales, 1976, p. 8). These include beside most of the groups mentioned above, Indians and the migrant and seasonal

workers.

Cleared of the rhetoric the students are drawn from all walks of life, all age groups and the entire range of aptitudes, including the mentally retarded. The only exception are those whose genetic or physical disabilities make them incapable of profiting from association with the college. Categories of noncampus students not ordinarily found on a campus college are educators from other colleges enrolled in staff development programs, and military and civilian personnel in overseas bases.

All of the colleges have a preponderance of part-time students--from 80 percent at Whatcom, to more than 90 percent at Vermont and even higher proportion at the colleges in multicampus districts. For comparison nationally, in 1975 the percentage of part-time students was about 55 percent; in a dozen states the percentage ranged from 60 percent to 70 percent. In the state of Washington 57 percent of the enrollment was part-time. The proportion at three small campus colleges comparable to Whatcom was 58 percent in the Fall quarter of 1974, 59 percent in the Winter quarter of 1975 and 63 percent in the Spring quarter of 1975.

Although part-time enrollment is rising at campus colleges and at noncampus colleges, the proportion at the latter will continue to be higher because the scattered learning centers attract individuals who would not travel to a more distant campus to enroll in a course or two. Moreover, those individuals who may want to take more than one or two courses do not have the opportunity to do so because of the limited offerings at the learning centers. A third reason for the large part-time enrollment at noncampus colleges may be that the people they seek are not apt to or encouraged to enroll in a full-time program.

Enrollment

Headcount enrollment at Whatcom Community College has grown from 486 in 1970-71 to 2,150 in 1975-76 (Table 3). Full-time equivalent (FTE)

enrollment during the same period soared from 83 to 760 indicating that each year students have been enrolling for more credit hours than the previous year, from 2.6 to 5.3. In 1975-76, 61 percent of the students enrolled in fewer than 5 hours per quarter, 19 percent for 5 to 9 hours and 20 percent for ten or more hours. The proportion of day to evening students was 56 to 44 (McIntyre and Wales, 1976).

TABLE 3
ENROLLMENTS BY COURSES AND UNITS
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF VERMONT AND
WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE
1975-1976

Community College of Vermont[a]			Whatcom Community College[b]		
Number of Courses	Number of Individuals	% of Total	Number of Units	Number of Individuals	% of Total
1	1,172	70%	Fewer than 5	1,304	61%
2	372	22	5-9	409	19
3	114	7	10+	419	20
4 or 5	24	1			
	1,682	100%		2,132	100%

Sources: [a]Community College of Vermont, 1975c, p. 20.
[b]Whatcom Community College, 1976c, p. 1.

The student "intent" in order of preference was: 1) non-degree/non-certificate; 2) occupational supplementary; 3) liberal arts transfer; and 4) adult basic education. In credit hours the order of preference was transfer courses, 4,611; occupational courses, 4,413; general courses, 2,430.

Women outnumbered men by a small margin, 920 to 824. Up to age 49 the percentage of men and women was the same; but from age 50 and up the ratio of women to men was 126 to 77. The median age for women was 34; for men 33.

Of the 1,675 students enrolled who indicated their racial or ethnic background 1,549 were White, 63 Native American, 24 Asian, 24 Mexican American, 5 Black, and 7 Other American Ethnic Minority.

For the general population the ethnic and racial distribution in 1970 was 95 percent White, 2.5 percent Native American, 1.2 percent Spanish surname, and a few Asians, Blacks and others.

In Spring 1975 the Community College of Vermont enrolled 2,123 students; 31 percent men and 69 percent women. Continuing students represented 43 percent of the total; a marked improvement over the 33 percent in Spring 1973. Of 1,682 individuals tabulated, the majority 1,172 or 70 percent enrolled for 1 course; 372 or 22 percent in 2 courses; 114 or 7 percent in 3 courses and 24 or slightly more than 1 percent in 4 or 5 courses. The number of contracting students, those engaged in the degree process was 280 versus 1,843 non-contracting students or those who had not defined their educational goals in relation to a degree or certificate. Sixty degrees and one certificate were awarded in 1975. About 25 percent of the graduates transfer to four-year institutions each year (Community College of Vermont, 1975c).

In its academic divisions, continuing education courses and community services projects the Chicago City-Wide College serves a large and wide spectrum of the population. The academic divisions enrolled 1,800 in the Fall of 1975 and 24,000 in the Spring of 1976. An additional 60,000 enrolled in its continuing education courses. About 50 to 100,000 attended special community services projects, such as Focus, Forum, fairs, political candidates nights, diabetic and other health detection clinics, legal seminars, etc. (Chicago City Colleges, 1975).

The data (Table 4) in the academic divisions are classified as "enrollments managed by CCWI," "enrollments supervised by CCWI," and "enrollments coordinated by CCWI" reflecting the fact that "the College, really does not offer programs in its own right" (Grede, 1976a). For Fall 1975 the enrollments for the three classifications were 9,053, 2,242, 6,743 respectively. For the Spring 1976 semester they were 13,323, 3,392 and 7,472 respectively.

TABLE 4
ENROLLMENTS FOR CHICAGO CITY-WIDE COLLEGE (CCWC)
ACADEMIC DIVISIONS
FALL 1975 - SPRING 1976

Academic Divisions	Managed by CCWC Fall 1975	Spr 1976	Supervised by CCWC Fall 1975	Spr 1976	Coordinated by CCWC Fall 1975	Spr 1976	Grand Total
Center for Open Learning	907	4,522	1,413	2,223	---	---	
The Institutes	3,824	3,992	829	1,169	6,743	7,472	
Special Programs	4,322	4,809	---	---	---	---	
Totals Fall 1975	9,053		2,242		6,743		18,038
Spring 1976		13,323		3,392		7,472	24,187
Continuing Education		35,000					

Source: Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, p. 28.

Table 5 lists the various categories and the approximate number of students enrolled in the continuing education courses. Special attention is called to the large number, 550, of blind, deaf and mentally retarded--a group that has only in recent years become a concern of the community colleges. Women over 40 years of age comprise 75 percent of the adult education group, an unusually high percentage. A considerable number of the senior citizens and others are college graduates, sometimes classified as reverse transfers. Normal for an urban college is the large enrollment of minorities and immigrant groups.

TABLE 5
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS
ENROLLED IN CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES
CHICAGO CITY-WIDE COLLEGE
YEARLY APPROXIMATIONS

Race or Color		Miscellaneous	
White	36,000	Women (40 years and above) (75% of adult education group)	45,000
Black	18,500	Senior Citizens	6,000
Latins	2,500	Immigrant Groups	2,000
American Indian	800	Blind, Deaf, Mentally Retarded	550
Orientals	600		

Source: Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, p. 38.

For Fall 1975 Pioneer Community College had a headcount enrollment of 726 in 12 credit courses. The opening Spring 1976 enrollment jumped to 2,000. By the end-of-semester the enrollment reached 6,000 (Hencey and Zeiger, 1976). Enrollment will increase beyond that as the off-campus credit and non-credit programs of the campus colleges are transferred. An example of the size of the group that will be transferred are the 2,300 students who attended courses on military bases and government offices conducted by a campus college

(Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1976b). Preliminary Fall 1976 enrollment was 3,000 with more expected to enroll (Keim, 1976a).

Enrollment at the Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study for the Spring 1976 was 935 in 40 semester courses, down from the Fall 1975 enrollment (Tapper, 1976).

Approximately 35,000 students are enrolled at the Chicago Urban Skills Institute; 1,065 in the Dawson Skill Center and more than 33,000 in the Adult Learning Skills Program. Forty-six percent of the students are Black, 23 percent have Spanish surnames, and the remaining 31 percent include Asians, Native Americans, Caucasians and others. More than half (55 percent) are between 25 and 30 years of age, equally divided between men and women.

The average income of the students is at or below the poverty level. About 20 percent receive Public Aid and large numbers are high school dropouts and/or unemployed. The Institute by contract with the U.S. Department of Labor recruits low income, disadvantaged men and women between 16 through 21 for Job Corps Centers and awards (or banks) college credit and certificates for training in the various Centers (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b).

Coastline Community College's enrollment for the Fall of 1976, when it first offered classes, exceeded the 20,000 mark (Luskin, 1976b).

The potential enrollment of the Office for New Dimensions will depend upon the services or programs that will be assigned to it. Enrollments in Fall 1975 (Cherdack, 1976) for those most likely to become a part of the new institution were:

1.	Instructional Television	2,559
2.	Educational Telephone Network	222
3.	Cooperative Education Classes	5,437
4.	Overseas Program	3,997
5.	Government Education Center	200
	Total	12,415

6. Community Services
   a. classes only 17,250
   b. recreational, cultural and social activities 350,000

Community services classes and activities will be shared, the Office for New Dimensions concentrating on district-wide classes and activities and the campuses on classes within their jurisdiction. Outreach credit classes have not been transferred to the New Dimensions organization.

Except for Whatcom Community College enrollment data are insufficien for making judgments on the relative effectiveness of noncampus and campus colleges on access. Enrollment comparisons are also difficult because for some years before the appearance of noncampus colleges, many campus colleges had been operating outreach centers, and recruiting practically every category of student, traditional and nontraditional.

The data in Table 6 show that Whatcom's credit-enrollment trend pattern is similar to that of most campus colleges, very high growth rates during the first three or four years followed by lower growth rates. Whatcom's enrollment increased by 50 percent in the second year, almost doubled in the third year, then slowed down to 27 percent in the fourth year and to less than 10 percent per year in the next two years and to 2 percent in 1976. During the same period the national growth rate remained the same for 1971 and 1972, but was on an upward slope doubling from 1972 to 1975 before slowing down in 1976. The growth rate for 26 Washington community colleges (not including Whatcom) was slightly higher than for Whatcom in 1974 and 75 percent higher in 1975.

TABLE 6
ENROLLMENTS
WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND
ALL PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES
1970-1975

	Whatcom		All Public Two-Year Colleges		Washington Colleges Minus Whatcom	
	Number[a]	Percent Increase	Number[b]	Percent Increase	Number[b]	Percent Increase
1970	486		2,366,000		95,200	
1971	726	49	2,544,000	8	96,500	1
1972	1439	96	2,730,000	7	98,800	4
1973	1839	27	3,014,000	10	102,100	3
1974	2000	9	3,394,000	13	112,000	10
1975	2150	8	3,927,000	16	127,300	14

Sources: [a]Mahlberg, 1976, p. 7.
[b]American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972, p. 91.
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973, p. 87.
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974, p. 88.
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975, p. 92.
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976, p. 96.

The McIntyre and Wales study of Whatcom's success in "assessing and meeting the needs of its target groups" concluded that Whatcom "did no better than its counterpart With Campus." The research team felt that Whatcom's performance was disappointing "since Whatcom stated so specifically the target groups they sought to serve, and since (theoretically) a basic goal of external degree programs is to serve more 'new students' than traditional campus-based institutions." The disappointment was "somewhat ameliorated by data from Britain's Open University," where "there too many fewer of the 'new' type of students...used the services" it provided (McIntyre and Wales, 1976, p. 24).

For the Fall of 1976 preliminary enrollment reports for all higher education institutions indicate a modest rate of increase or decline. In the two-year colleges full-time student enrollment declined 1.2 percent and part-time enrollment increased by 3.8 percent ("If Enrollments Are Down, It's First Drop Since 1951," 1976). This is a sharp decline from the overall 14 percent increase reported for 1975. Among noncampus colleges included in this survey Pioneer and Whatcom have reported increases in enrollment.

Summary

By the nature of its operation in many scattered places and its emphasis on serving students who cannot or will not attend full-time and/or need specialized programs the students will be predominantly part-timers. Whereas the proportion of part-time to full-time students at campus colleges rarely exceeds 3 to 1, at Vermont the ratio for 1976 is more than 9 to 1 and at Whatcom 4 to 1. Except for the Chicago institutions statistics for the colleges in multicampus districts are not yet available; however, from the impression one receives from the brochures and the proportion of part-time to full-time students will be closer to that at Vermont than at Whatcom.

The average age of students is higher than at campus colleges and the proportion of women to men is also higher, at some colleges it is slightly so while at others it is significantly so. Students at the Community College of Vermont and at Whatcom Community College are carrying more classes per term than during the early years of the colleges. While much is made of nontraditional learning most students are enrolled in regular classes. It is too early to determine whether the noncampus colleges will attract a larger proportion of the population than the campus colleges with outreach programs. The students receive more attention from counselors and other support services than do students in outreach centers supervised by campus college personnel.

FACULTY

The overwhelming majority of instructors in noncampus colleges teach on a part-time basis. The unusually high proportion of part-time instructors employed is partly by administrative choice and partly the result of operating in small, scattered learning units. In the independent colleges the decision to operate in many locations rather than on a fixed location was also accompanied by a decision to staff the colleges with part-time instructors. The other noncampus colleges continued the practice of hiring part-time faculty when they took over the off-campus units of campus colleges.

In neither case did the noncampus college pioneer in this practice. Nor did the practice originate with nontraditional education. The use of part-time instructors has been a part of education almost from its beginning. The major difference between the practice before 1950 and today is that then it was used almost exclusively to staff evening classes while today it is used to staff day classes, as well as, evening classes. The trend toward hiring part-time instructors for day classes in campus and noncampus colleges has not abated, although there is a strong movement against the practice led by part-time and full-time faculty organizations.

Noncampus college administrators prefer part-time instructors for many of the same reasons expressed by campus administrators--cost, control, flexibility, expediency and enrichment of the educational offerings. Part-time instructors are paid at a lower rate than full-time instructors, do not acquire tenure rights, receive very few fringe benefits, and can be separated on short notice if their special skills are no longer needed or if they prove unsatisfactory. They are (or were) more tractable and more amenable to administrative suggestion than full-time instructors.

The colleges feel they can obtain the part-time services of "community personnel with demonstrated expertise in their several fields of endeavor" (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1975, p. 7)

often "with other than the usual academic training and experience" (Tapper, 1976, p. 7). These are the "craftsman sharing his art, a local lawyer teaching law, the director of a local day care center conducting a course in child development...a town official teaching a class in local government" (Coastline Community College, 1976b, p. 27), an infusion of talent that is necessary "to keep from drifting toward a state of rigid traditionalism" (Mertes, 1975, p. 6). Not only does the college have access to special talents, but it is the most practical way to staff classes in widely scattered outreach centers with low student potential, or classes that meet a special, temporary need. Where a school facility is borrowed or rented it is expedient to employ an instructor who teaches at the school (Vermont Community Colleges, 1973). It is doubtful that many outreach centers could be maintained if full-time instructors had to be employed. Probably, the lower salaries of part-time instructors has been a very important consideration in the spread of the practice.

Noncampus colleges also employ full-time instructors but only in exceptional circumstances or when they are required to do so by contractual obligations or by collective bargaining agreements. Full-time instructors often are hired to perform nonteaching functions: counseling, scheduling, writing course outlines, producing media, acting as mentors for a group of part-time instructors, and such chores. Where a government contract provides for a 30-hour class schedule for trainees full-time instructors are almost mandatory.

Despite all of these contingencies the proportion of part-time to full-time instructors approaches 100 percent in some colleges. In 1976 all 350 instructors of the Community College of Vermont were part-timers as were the 700 instructors at Coastline when it opened in September, 1976. Whatcom Community College had a ratio of 86 to 12; at Pioneer Community College it was 75 to 6 on "hard money" funds; 75 to 28 if those paid on "soft money" from funded projects are included (Keim, 1976b). The Chicago Urban Skills Institute had a ratio of 1800 to 109, the latter, instructors in the William L. Dawson

Chicago Skill Center, a day operation under government contract and the former, mostly evening division instructors in the Adult Learning Skills Program (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b).

Educational institutions have had very little difficulty recruiting the large numbers of part-time instructors. In the last five years the supply of applicants has increased at a higher rate than the number of available positions. As long as the decline in full-time day positions continues, the supply of part-time applicants will grow.

Sources of Part-Time Faculty

Part-time faculty are recruited from three principal sources: other educational institutions, recent university graduates, and non-educational fields. The proportion that comes from each source will be influenced by such factors as the nature of the educational program, the location of the learning centers, and the feelings of the administrators concerning the relative quality of each source.

Colleges with a heavy accent on academic preparation tend to select instructors from other educational institutions and from graduate schools. Elementary, secondary and adult education schools are a principal source for remedial and adult education courses. In multi-college districts the full-time day instructors in the campus colleges are a large source, particularly if the district policy or collective bargaining agreement gives these instructors priority to part-time assignments.

In all areas quite a few part-time instructors are recruited from business, government and noneducational fields. Many of these are professionals in medicine, law, government, and accounting qualified to teach specialized career-type and regular academic courses. In metropolitan areas where a large number of schools and colleges are located the choices are greater than in rural areas with few educational institutions.

Qualifications of Part-Time Instructors

In discussions on the growing practice of hiring large numbers of

part-time instructors, questions concerning their qualifications invariably arise and comparisons are made with the qualifications of full-time instructors. As with many evaluative judgments of educational practices there is little objective evidence to support the differing judgments. Most are subjective, often rationalizations to support one's opinion or practice. It is as unlikely for administrators to state that part-time instructors are not as well qualified as full-time instructors as it is for tenured faculty and their representatives to state the opposite.

Nearly all studies show that as a group part-time instructors have lower qualifications as measured by formal education and less teaching experience than full-time instructors. Studies also show that part-time instructors receive very little orientation, pre-service, or in-service help preparatory to taking up their teaching duties. Despite these observable differences there is very little evidence that part-time instructors are inferior teachers to full-time or vice versa. There is also little evidence to support the claim that colleges "are hiring from private business and industry and other public sectors the most highly qualified individuals as determined by their professional colleagues in that given employment sector" (Mertes, 1975, p. 7).

Indicative of the composition and characteristics of part-time instructors employed by the Community College of Vermont is the following profile of 350 instructors employed in the Fall of 1975 to teach 410 courses:

- Almost half are under 30 years old;
- More than two-thirds have at least a B.A. Degree;
- 46% were teaching for the first time;
- Over half have taught in their field for over 3 years;
- Almost half have been working in their field for over 6 years;
- 35% are currently teaching in another institution;

- Over half have received some other form of teacher certification (Community College of Vermont, 1975a, p. 9).

In-Service Training

Rather than get involved in the debate about the relative merits of part-time versus full-time instructors noncampus college administrators are developing or plan to develop extensive improvement of instruction programs for their part-time and full-time instructors. They seem to sense that in this area they will be judged more critically for any deficiencies than the traditional colleges.

In their dreams about the future "the problems and challenges of inspiring both full- and part-time faculty and staff" rank high among the priorities (Coastline Community College, 1976b, p. 25). Essential to the success of this new enterprise is the maintenance of "a staff development focus...[to help] each person to realize her/his fullest potential, since an academic institution should do no less for its employees than for others" (Tapper, 1976, p. 7).

A large part of in-service training includes an understanding of the functions and objectives of a noncampus college (Coastline Community College, 1976b), in particular to "gain an appreciation for non-traditional education, its various forms, its possible benefits,... and how each staff person can best develop his or her potential in the college" (Tapper, 1976, p. 15). "A planned program of orientation to learning commitments, college mission, and purpose" will be developed at Coastline Community College (1976b, p. 28).

Another goal is to encourage faculty to use new methods of teaching. Some expect to achieve this goal by recruiting and developing "a faculty which can be flexibly responsive to changing needs and diverse students, open to ideas, willing to experiment" (Tapper, 1976, p. 7). Others will undertake a study to determine the various teaching methods that have succeeded elsewhere (Erickson, 1976).

Several of the noncampus colleges will have a unit for staff development. Thus the Institute for Cooperative Programs of the Office

for New Dimensions "will work with the colleges and District offices to develop in-service training programs for both certificated and classified staff" (Erickson, 1976, p. 61). In the multicollege districts some noncampus colleges will offer an in-service program not only for its own personnel but for all personnel in the district and on a contractual basis for personnel of non-district colleges (Los Angeles Community College District, 1976b). Pioneer Community College hopes to "serve as a catalyst for Districtwide renewal by providing opportunities for 'staff development' and program exploration and experimentation...[for] all colleges and personnel" (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1975, p. 23). Peralta College will "provide opportunities...for faculty from other institutions by encouraging short-term exchanges, and opportunities to test pilot projects in a structure conducive to innovation" (Tapper, 1976, p. 7). Also in most multicollege districts noncampus college instructors have opportunities to participate in district programs, e.g., improvement leaves, sabbaticals, workshops, seminars, instructional grants (Coastline Community College, 1976b).

At the Community College of Vermont a teaching support staff is responsible for helping instructors set up classes, plan courses, find materials, evaluate learning, and "generally aid each course to run unencumbered" (Community College of Vermont, 1973, p. 9). The staff conducts orientation, workshops, periodic meetings, forums, and semester-end evaluations. The purposes of the various activities are to "explore the many dimensions of creative teaching with adults," to share faculty experiences, to bring in expert resources to add to faculty effectiveness, and to explain the Community College of Vermont philosophy, demonstrate techniques of teaching, "setting individual objectives and evaluation of student performance, [and the] variety of teaching approaches [as a method of appealing] to disparate needs of individuals" (Vermont Community Colleges, Central Vermont Regional Site Planning Section, 1973, p. 2). The 7-step "Teacher Support System" includes:

1. Orientation of teachers through individual meetings with all teachers and a teacher workshop.
2. An in-process training system will be designed....
3. There will be a minimum of one classroom contact with teacher during objective-setting session.
4. Weekly calls to all teachers, with appropriate records being kept.
5. Final evaluation presented to staff for their action.
6. Teacher Support staff will find teachers, space (with assistance from Coordinator), and make arrangements for materials and everything related to setting up class.
7. Teacher Support staff will set up monthly rap sessions for teachers (Vermont Community Colleges, Northeast Kingdom Site Planning Section, 1973, Appendix C).

The College has also prepared a detailed description of its competence-based approach to learning as contrasted with the credit-based system. Though this description is directed at students the information is valuable for the instructors as well (Community College of Vermont, 1975b). No other college has as detailed a staff development program.

An important part of staff development includes communication in various forms. Most common are faculty manuals with information on every conceivable contingency likely to be encountered by the faculty member. As an example, Vital Information For Faculty of Pioneer Community College concentrates on "information about organization and procedures" and focuses "upon those matters which directly affect the faculty" (1975, p. 1). The manual tends to be directive in that it outlines for the faculty member the limits within which he is to function in and out of the classroom and his relationships with the administration, the students, and, to a limited extent, other faculty members. It is devoid of the rhetoric associated with other material distributed by the college. From a practical point of view it may be the most important communication a faculty member

receives.

The college policy handbook of the Community College of Vermont helps achieve "common understanding...of accepted decision making and decision implementing." The handbook acts as "a manual through which any member of the staff can initiate action to solve a problem he has or sees in the organization" (Smith, 1976, p. 75).

Catalogs directed to a broader audience, often are more specific about the philosophy of the college, the objectives and the ways the students may obtain their education. The Whatcom Community College Catalog (1976b) while directed at students and their parents reveals to the faculty member much of the hopes that the administrators have for the college. The 1976/77 Catalog outlines the history, goals and commitment of the college. From instructional philosophy and programs of the college the faculty member may note that the traditional education and the familiar functions of transfer and career education continue to hold a prominent place alongside the nontraditional and the alternative learning options. Schedules of classes provide information on the number of outpost locations, their relative size and kind of class offerings.

In concluding this section on the faculty it is necessary to mention that the noncampus administrators have not found the solution to effective in-service training. Colleges have a formal selection process based on staff prerequisites, but training procedures or formal in-service programs, with an exception or two, are absent. In fact, most of the plans mentioned are blueprints for the future.

Efforts to institute formal in-service programs have not been very successful because of costs involved, lack of response and the logistics of time and place for those teaching one night a week in widely scattered places. We have mentioned the unique program of the Community College of Vermont. More typical is Whatcom Community College's "non-mandatory, informal orientation for all faculty consisting of a programmed instructional package" (McIntyre and Wales, 1976, p. 23). It is not surprising that the

part-time instructors interviewed by a research team were "less aware of the goals and objectives" of the college than administrators (McIntyre and Wales, 1976, p. 24).

The Chicago City-Wide College frankly admits that there is little or no supervision of the faculty because they are functioning in locations distant from one another and from the central and regional headquarters (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c). Likewise at the Chicago Urban Skills Institute:

> "Staff development has proven almost impossible until the present time. The provisions of funding agencies...for contact-hours [(35) plus] the maximum work-hours [(40)] allowed to faculty by union contract, have coalesced to practically eliminate... released-time for staff development" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976b, p. 27).

Pay and Status

In addition to the problem of in-service training the noncampus colleges face two other complex faculty problems--pay and faculty status for their part-time instructors. As was indicated above one of the attractions of noncampus operation is its low cost, attributable in large part to the low pay of the part-time instructors. However, during the last five years part-time instructors aided by the professional teacher organizations have been pressing for redress on what they consider gross inequities, of low pay and lack of faculty status. This struggle involves all part-time instructors whether employed on campus and noncampus colleges, single noncampus colleges and those in multicollege districts. These problems will be treated separately.

Pay

For the institutions in this study the rates of pay vary from $8 per hour for all part-time instructors teaching in the Chicago Urban Skills Institute to the 75 percent prorata pay of the Chicago City Colleges' full-time instructors teaching an overload class in the Chicago City-Wide College (Table 7). The low $8 per hour rate of

Chicago Urban Skills Institute was carried over when the adult education classes of the public school system were transferred to the Chicago City Colleges system. The other rates are representative of the $10 to $32 per hour range paid by campus colleges. However, whatever the rate it is always lower than the comparable rate for full-time instructors in the same college. It is this differential that the part-time instructors are trying to narrow. Some success has been achieved in narrowing the gap but the progress has been slow because as part-time rates have risen so have full-time salaries.

The chief stumbling block to parity in pay scales is the definition of workload. Full-time instructors have, in theory at least, responsibilities in addition to classroom teaching while the part-time instructor has no responsibilities other than those attached to classroom teaching.

The Chicago and Peralta prorata schedules are a step toward the goal of equity in pay. They recognize the responsibility difference by prorating the part-time pay at less than 100 percent--75 percent for Chicago day instructors teaching an overload class and 65 percent for unemployed Peralta College part-time instructors and 60 percent for those who are employed full-time. In the Chicago system prorata is across the full salary schedule whereas in the Peralta College District it is limited to the first four steps of the salary schedule. These two prorata schedules produce a higher rate of pay than the per hour or per semester rate.

TABLE 7
PAY RATES FOR PART-TIME FACULTY

COLLEGE	RATES
Chicago City-Wide College[a]	$20 per hour for full-time district instructors teaching adult education classes 75% of regular salary for district instructors teaching college courses (12 credit hours is the normal load $600 to $1000 per course per semester for non-district instructors
Chicago Urban Skills Institute[a]	$8 per hour
Coastline Community College[b]	$12 to $16 per hour
Community College of Vermont[c]	$15 per 2-3 hour session, equivalent to $225 for standard length course
Office for New Dimensions[d]	$15.96 to 17.76 per hour for district instructors $15.19 to 17.63 per hour for non-district instructors
Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study[e]	Prorata--limited to steps 1 to 4, but including all columns on the salary schedule of regular certificated full-time employees a. 65 percent for instructors not employed full-time. b. 60 percent for instructors employed full-time.
Pioneer Community College[f]	$12.625 per contact hour or $250 per credit hour per semester whichever is greater
Whatcom Community College[g]	$184 per teaching credit per quarter

Sources: [a]Grede, 1976b.
[b]Luskin, 1976c.
[c]Community College of Vermont, 1975c, p. 73.
[d]Los Angeles Community College District, 1976c, p. 5.
[e]Elsner, 1976.
[f]Keim, 1976b.
[g]Whatcom Community College, 1976a, p. 9.

Faculty Status

Associated with the pay issue for instructors who are not day instructors working on an overload basis is the status issue, which essentially comes down to regular faculty status. Regular faculty status carries with it not only a salary based on the full-time instructor's salary, but fringe benefits, participation in the department and college governance, and job security or tenure. Only a few part-time instructors obtain faculty status; most colleges by policy prevent part-time faculty from attaining regular faculty status by limiting the working load to one course or three to five units and by not renewing an assignment beyond one year.

Some progress is being made in the improvement of part-time instructors' status through collective bargaining agreements, college policies and state laws that attempt to prevent administrators from exploiting part-time instructors by hiring two or more of them to teach what amounts to a full load of classes (Lombardi, 1975). In the Report of the Commission on New Dimensions the issue of part-time to full-time instructors is addressed by the recommendations that:

> 1. All personnel should be recruited and selected in accordance with appropriate District personnel practices...
>
> 5. Certificated instructors should be assigned to programs on a full-time basis whenever possible and should be compensated at their regular rate (Erickson, 1976, p. 48).

In California the full-time part-time faculty organizations are supporting legislation to limit the number of part-time instructors that may be employed in any district, to remove the distinction between day and evening colleges and programs, to require the payment of prorata salary and to make part-time instructors eligible for tenure. The organizations also plan to press for these provisions during negotiations under the new collective bargaining law. In the meantime the California Teachers Association, an NEA affiliate, the American Federation of Teachers and the Part-Time Instructors Association are appealing to the courts to direct "the District to classify [part-

time instructors] as contract (probationary) or regular (permanent) employees...and to compensate part-time instructors of the same Salary Schedule in proportion to the amount of time actually served..." (Ferris v. Los Rios Community College, 1976, p. 2). As of October 1976 about 17 identical suits had been filed against community college districts (also see Plosser and Hammel, 1976).

A great deal of progress has been made in Washington. Whatcom Community College following state law has a policy on "Permanent Faculty Status" under which probationary part-time faculty may achieve permanent appointments after teaching for six consecutive quarters, and after being recommended by a review committee and approved by the Board. However, at any time during the six quarters "a probationary faculty appointment...may be terminated without cause upon the expiration of the term of employment" (Whatcom Community College, 1974b, p. 1). Despite this qualification the policy is a long step in the direction of granting tenure to part-time instructors. As of Fall 1976, 12 instructors were on permanent faculty status.

There are several consequences for the noncampus college as the status and pay of part-time instructors improves. One it reduces the per capita cost differential between the noncampus and campus operation. A second probable effect will be a change in the imbalance of part-time to full-time instructors.

As part-time faculty rates approach full-time rates the cost incentive for hiring part-time instructors becomes less important. And if part-time instructors achieve regular faculty status, administrators may find it advantageous to hire more full-time instructors than they are now doing. However part-time instructors will continue to outnumber full-time instructors because it will be impractical and financially inexpedient to hire full-time instructors for special classes with low enrollment and for classes in areas with few students. And as long as day faculty members are permitted to work on an overload basis they will, in multicollege noncampus colleges, seek priority to part-time assignments.

Summary

The noncampus colleges are staffed by part-time instructors with a sprinkling of full-time instructors. The part-timers tend to be younger and have lower educational and experiential qualifications. In-service training programs are largely blueprints for the future. Pay and status are still major concerns of the faculty, although part-time wage rates have increased and some colleges are using prorata schedules ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent of the full-time schedules. Fringe benefits are almost non-existent. Except at Whatcom Community College very few part-time instructors are eligible for regular faculty status with full prorata pay, fringe benefits and tenure.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

The noncampus colleges have special problems. Some are common to the independent and multicollege units; others are unique to each group. Some have been alluded to in the various sections and others will be discussed here.

Challenging the ingenuity and imagination of noncampus administrator are the feelings of invisibility with no physical image with which anyone connected with the college can maintain himself personally and professionally. The invisibility extends to students and faculty who "emerge from and blend back into the community" (Smith, 1976, p. 70). President Smith of the Community College of Vermont who made these observations added that the advantages of flexibility, accountability and responsiveness gained in "giving up the physical structure and distinct culture of the campus" are obtained by the surrender of "traditional institutional reference points which bind campuses together" (Smith, 1976, p. 70). Even more frustrating,

> "There's nothing to shake your fist at when you're angry, there's no place to retreat when you're confused, and there is no physical image in your mind. It's easy to say that education is

> a process and a college is a series of processes designed to help students learn, but it's very difficult to maintain yourself personally and professionally in a world of processes" (Smith, 1976, p. 70).

In one way or another those connected with noncampus colleges echo Smith's impressions. The Los Angeles Commission on New Dimensions called attention to the problems created by "the very nature of the new institution," specifically that "students would be even more transient than those of the other colleges. Dropping in and out would be even more pronounced. Many of the New Dimensions students would never see anything with which they would necessarily and specifically identify as a 'campus' of their college" (Erickson, 1976, p. 45). The administrators of Coastline Community College assert that "A college without walls obviously cannot exist without some physical facilities--something with which a student body can identify" (Coastline Community College, 1976b, p. 37).

Invisibility and isolation are implicit in the first sentence of a brochure admonishing the reader: "Don't plan to take a walking tour of the Pioneer Community College campus" (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1976a, p. 1). The feeling of isolation caused by the nature of the noncampus operations in many scattered locations with few opportunities for communication between and among faculty and students, and less so with administrators was one of the first impressions President Tapper of the Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study received soon after her appointment (Tapper, 1976).

The noncampus colleges are attempting to overcome the feeling of isolation and particularly the need for symbols of identity with headquarters buildings and smaller regional subheadquarters. The headquarters building located at a permanent central location will help identify the college with the community and substitute as a symbol with which the staff, faculty and students can identify. The regional sites staffed with counselors, facilitators, financial aid officers and other student personnel employees will act as focal points for students and faculty and will help associate the immediate community

with the college.

This stress on buildings seems incongruous in the face of the many advantages claimed for a college without a fixed campus. Paradoxically, "permanent" subcampuses are developing, at large regional units of the noncampus colleges particularly at those located on military installations and at sites with large concentrations of students.

The colleges are not relying on buildings alone to create a bond among students, faculty, administrators and community. They are directing major efforts toward the development of an extensive and effective communication system among the learning units and the central and regional headquarters. At Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study, Tapper is endeavoring to give the faculty a feeling of involvement and commitment by meeting "with [them] individually and collectively" and by involving "them in evaluating the program, identifying needs, and planning future offerings" (Tapper, 1976, p. 12). She is also relying on various programs such as the "Lunch and Learn" series located in businesses and public agencies "to provide increased awareness of learning, to let people know there is a college in their midst, and to create a future...constituency" (Tapper, 1976, p. 13).

Identification with the college will also come about in the normal course of time as the number of students and participants grows. Some of these will acquire degrees; others certificates and various honors; many will be recipients of student aid, beneficiaries of placement and counseling services and participants at college sponsored events--all of which will create a bond with the college. Faculty identification will be encouraged if more of them are granted regular status with the prerequisites that go with it. The publicity which the noncampus college receives as a nontraditional, forward-looking, innovative institution will also have a positive effect on those associated with the college.

In perspective one needs to be reminded that the campus colleges have also experienced some of the same identity feelings, feelings which have not completely disappeared.

Another kind of problem--the inverse of the identity problem--faced by the noncampus college in multicollege districts is the adverse effect of the large amount of publicity it is receiving and the apparent "favorite" college status it seems to be enjoying in the district. Far from being invisible its presence is felt by the campus faculty as control over the off-campus units is transferred, as some administrators are transferred or replaced, as faculty lose priority over part-time evening assignments, and as enrollment growth increases at the noncampus college and decreases at the campus colleges. No matter how equitably the distribution of funds is made the campus colleges tend to feel that they are receiving a smaller share than the noncampus college.

An associated problem is that "as a concept non-traditional education does not have total acceptance..." partly because "it is not well known" (Maricopa Technical Community College, 1976, Part II, p. 12). A few examples will illustrate the widespread incidence of these two phenomena.

In an accreditation report the staff of the Chicago City-Wide College stated:

> "There must be extensive and effective communication with the other units...lest the Institute be seen as a competitor for scarce resources and for students. The President and the deans have been visiting the campuses and presenting the Institute to faculty and administration. New and more imaginative ways of communicating must be found to dispel misconceptions about the Institute and its mission" (Chicago City Colleges, 1976c, pp. 63-4).

Wade and Smith of the Community College of Vermont noted that despite "all the fanfare and active support" the college has had to contend with "a vein of disapproval that was...strong" enough to almost cause the 1976 Legislature to scuttle the college. The "lesson" they "learned from the College's wintry struggle was that community-based education is difficult to define to non-educators and even harder to defend to traditional ones" (Wade and Smith, 1976, p. 3). Smith's experience with the state legislature is not unlike that of Chancellor Leslie Koltai's with the Los Angeles Board of Trustees. Although Koltai had

the foresight to appoint a commission on New Dimensions of 13 representing faculty, campus administrators, and central office personnel, the Board was not enthusiastic about the New Dimensions institution. After much debate the Board reluctantly approved the Chancellor's recommendation but without according full college status.

Before Chancellor Norman Watson of Coast Community College District obtained the Board of Trustees' approval of Coastline Community College he had to turn over control of the evening divisions to the respective campuses--an operation that had always been run from the central office as a separate unit. This action mollified the opponents of the non-campus college, but it did not make them enthusiastic supporters.

After the Fall 1976 reports of the Metropolitan Community College District colleges showed that enrollment at the three campus colleges had dropped while the enrollment at Pioneer Community College had increased, the feelings of the campus personnel were graphically expressed by President Keim who wrote "You can imagine the thunder and lightning I am getting from the faculty senate of the District and the running gun fight with the three traditional colleges" (1976a).

President Robert Hamill of Whatcom has to contend with other community college presidents who are not favorably disposed toward supporting changes in the state funding patterns to substitute for the capital outlay funds which Whatcom does not need, extra allotments for transportation and delivery of services to the outreach centers. Neither has the Legislature, probably because the other state colleges are opposed to it, been sympathetic to proposals to fund the college on a per student or per course basis rather than on the full-time student equivalent basis. Moreover, because funding patterns are largely based on class attendance "some non-traditional efforts generate no state aid" (Maricopa Technical Community College, 1976, Part II, p. 12).

In the multicampus district where the noncampus college is given jurisdiction over all outreach programs the problems of jurisdictional conflicts and duplication of services are eliminated or kept in check.

Unfortunately, where the roles are ill-defined the problems are compounded. Until respective roles are defined the noncampus college activities have to be carefully chosen so as not to compete with those of the other colleges and also because "many people in the district and in the community are requesting some conception of the College, so that they may know how it will fit into their own planning" (Tapper, 1976, p. 1).

How much longer the noncampus colleges can keep operating with temporary, part-time faculty is a question that administrators think about with apprehensiveness. Not only would the cost of full-time or permanent part-time instructors require a larger share of the financial resources but their employment would limit the college's "responsiveness... to their areas of expertise" and would cause "the needs assessment system [to] lose much of its importance" (Community College of Vermont, 1975c, p. 16).

Which of the two major reasons--lower cost or greater staffing flexibility--is the controlling factor for continuing the practice is difficult to assess. Probably, there is a little of each in the decision. It seems unlikely that administrators--campus or noncampus--will be able to stem the movement toward higher pay and some form of permanent employment for part-time instructors. In nearly all of the institutions the pay and to a lesser extent the status of part-time instructors has been improving. It is an anomalous position for nontraditional educators whose objective is education for a better society to ignore the opportunity to achieve a better working situation for their part-time instructors.

Adding to the difficulties of the noncampus college educators is their inability to demonstrate the effectiveness of nontraditional education (Maricopa Technical Community College, 1976). As with other nontraditional educators they "have not learned to package and price this product insofar as these non-traditional students and programs are concerned" (Hagemeyer, 1976) or "to evaluate...success with successive groups of new students except in terms of ever increasing enrollments of all types of students" (Knoell, 1976, p. 25). These criticisms apply

to traditional education as well, but because the nontraditionalists are making the claims of the superiority of nontraditional education over traditional education they are being asked for the proof.

Empirically, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the noncampus college will increase access to higher education. Obviously, where an area has had no college or off-campus programs access is increased by the opening of a noncampus college, as was true for Whatcom County in Washington and for the state of Vermont. In multicollege districts increased access may be achieved by the greater attention noncampus college administrators give to recruiting those not attending college. Since most campus colleges have outreach programs it is difficult to compare the noncampus college effect on access with the effect of a campus college operating off-campus programs. The Whatcom study (McIntyre and Wales, 1976) does not support the claim that a noncampus college attracts more people than a campus college with outreach programs.

These problems and frustrations, plus time, have a debilitating effect on the chief administrators. Evidence of weariness, fatigue, even tedium are surfacing. Rebuffs by legislators and boards of trustees, snipings by colleagues in traditional colleges, indifference of faculty members to the goals of nontraditional education, less than full commitment by subordinates, and the difficulty of measuring effectiveness of nontraditional learning contribute to these symptoms. They may, in part, account for the slow progress in transforming the educational process and for the many compromises with traditional concepts.

For the older noncampus colleges a change of leadership, which becomes more probable each year, may produce a counter movement toward the more traditional. New leaders are not likely to have the same fervor on behalf of nontraditional education as the founders; they are more likely to make adjustments to the old order than their predecessors.

CONCLUSION

Despite its problems, serious though some of them may be, it is evident from this study that the noncampus college is more than a passing fad that will quietly disappear after a few years. In the short period of less than 10 years it has become firmly established. Admittedly, it is in a state of flux, a welcome condition, indicating that it has not yet succumbed to a new orthodoxy of its own. The differences among the colleges continue to be as significant as their similarities.

The colleges described in this paper are being joined by at least an equal number in various parts of the country; in densely populated urban areas, in low density areas, and in mixed areas. The college form is one answer to the effective administration of the large number of outreach programs that most colleges have started. It enables a community with limited financial resources to provide educational programs without large outlays for capital expenditures. Its flexibility in starting and phasing out programs at minimum costs is invaluable in making adjustments to economic and population changes. Therefore it seems reasonable to state even this early that outreach programs are better for having their own administration than an administration whose major responsibility is a campus college.

Significant advances have been made in several areas: the organization of the scattered learning units into a cohesive collegiate format; the grouping of outreach centers into regions with necessary personnel and material resources; the creation of an effective communication and a regular delivery system between the individual learning centers and the administrative offices; the substitution of regional offices for the departmental/divisional patterns; and the combining of student activities with community services activities.

The noncampus institutions, true to their commitment to the non-traditional concept, have started out with a variety of organizations, learning delivery systems, and functions. One or two are difficult to

distinguish from campus colleges; one focuses on lower-than-college grade education; a few are assuming functions that traditionally have been considered upper division. They are so nontraditional that not even the bond that holds the group together--no campus, no permanent buildings--is sacred, as some develop subcampuses on permanent sites with permanent buildings.

At the present time (1977) it seems that the nontraditional noncampus college is not deviating too far from the traditional campus college, partly because it has retained many of its attributes and partly because the campus college has been moving cautiously toward nontraditional education.

The noncampus college owes much to the external degree or college without walls movement but at present there seems to be little evidence that it will embrace the external degree or college without walls format. It is likely to remain a classroom-oriented institution.

What the noncampus college needs least of all are the enthusiasts who are promoting it as the panacea for all of society's shortcomings. The noncampus college will have as little effect on solving society's major problems as the campus college whether community or university. The noncampus college's major responsibility is to encourage people to enroll and to help those who do to fulfill their objectives.

The noncampus college will flourish because it brings order out of confusion in the operation of the outreach programs and offers more opportunity to more people through more outreach programs than can be offered by the campus college. It is reasonable to expect that the noncampus college will seek more opportunities for and be more receptive to experimentation than the campus college, acknowledging that it is one thing to have opportunities and to be receptive; it is another to recognize the one and do the other.

While the noncampus college is here to stay it will not in the foreseeable future replace the campus college. Its success, however, does not depend on this contingency any more than the success of the community college depended upon the disappearance of the lower division of the four-year college and university.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alicea, V.G., and Schaefer, D.P. A Proposal for the Development of Ramon E. Betances Community College. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Puerto Rican Research and Resources Center, 1973. 111pp. ED 118 173.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1974 Community and Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1974.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1973 Community and Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1973.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1976.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1975 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1975.

American Association of Junior Colleges. 1972 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1972.

California Community Colleges. Postsecondary Alternatives Report. Sacramento, Calif.: Board of Governors, September 22-23, 1976.

Cherdack, A.N. Personal Communication. Los Angeles, Calif.: Los Angeles Community College District, Office of Educational Research and Analysis, October 5, 1976.

Chicago City Colleges. The Chicago City-Wide Institute of the City Colleges of Chicago. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago City-Wide Institute, 1975. 43pp. ED 124 227.

Chicago City Colleges. The Chicago Urban Skills Institute Catalogue, First Draft. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Urban Skills Institute, [1976a].

Chicago City Colleges. Status Report for the North Central Association. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Urban Skills Institute, April 1976b.

74

Chicago City Colleges. Status Report for the North Central Association. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago City-Wide Institute, May 1976c.

Coastline Community College (California). Catalog/Class Schedule 1976-1977. Fountain Valley, Calif., 1976a.

Coastline Community College (California). Report to Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Fountain Valley, Calif., 1976b. 54pp. ED 129 372.

Community College of Vermont. Annual Report, Community College of Vermont. Year Ended June 30, 1973. Montpelier, Ver., 1973. 39pp. ED 095 963.

Community College of Vermont. Annual Report 1975, Community College of Vermont. Year Ending June 30, 1975. Montpelier, Ver., 1975a.

Community College of Vermont. Contracting Materials. Montpelier, Ver., 1975b. 143pp. ED 126 989.

Community College of Vermont. Report of the Institutional Self-Study. Montpelier, Ver., 1975c.

Elsner, P.A. Personal Communication. Oakland, Calif.: Peralta Community College District, Office of Vice-Chancellor, December 3, 1976.

Erickson, L.J. (Ed.) New Dimensions for the Los Angeles Community College District. Report of the Commission on New Dimensions. Los Angeles, Calif.: Los Angeles Community College District, 1976. 138pp. ED 116 756.

Ferris v. Los Rios Community College, No. 261367 (Superior Court of California, filed June 3, 1976). Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

Grede, J. Personal Communication. Chicago, Ill.: City Colleges of Chicago, Office of the Vice-Chancellor, September 28, 1976a.

Grede, J. Personal Communication. Chicago, Ill.: City Colleges of Chicago, Office of the Vice-Chancellor, November 3, 1976b.

Hagemeyer, R.H. Reaction to the Open Door: Which Direction. Speech presented at the 56th Annual Conference of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., March 1976.

Hancock, E.H. Personal Communication. Oakland, Calif.: Peralta Community College District, Office of Management Information Systems, January 26, 1977.

Hencey, R.E., and Zeiger, D. "And Now For Something Completely Different." Community and Junior College Journal, 46 (8): 16-17; May 1976.

Houle, C.O. The External Degree. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

"If Enrollments Are Down, It's First Drop Since 1951." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 13 (8): 3; October 25, 1976.

Illinois Community College Board. "Selected Data of Illinois Public Community Colleges." Community College Bulletin, 11 (2): 4; September-October 1976.

Keim, W.A. Personal Communication. Kansas City, Mo.: Pioneer Community College, Office of the President, September 16, 1976a.

Keim, W.A. Personal Communication. Kansas City, Mo.: Pioneer Community College, Office of the President, October 8, 1976b.

Knoell, D.M. "Changing Enrollment Patterns--Changing Functions." The College Board Review, No. 99, Spring 1976.

Lombardi, J. Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges. Topical Paper No. 54. Los Angeles, Calif.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975. 62pp. ED 115 316.

Los Angeles Community College District. Final Budget 1976-77. Los Angeles, Calif.: Office of the Chancellor, 1976a.

Los Angeles Community College District. Office for New Dimensions. Los Angeles, Calif., pamphlet, 1976b.

Los Angeles Community College District. Salary Schedules. Los Angeles, Calif.: Personnel Services Division, 1976c.

Los Angeles Community College District. State of the District. Los Angeles, Calif.: Office of the Chancellor, 1976d.

Los Angeles Community Colleges Overseas. 76-77 Catalog. Los Angeles, Calif.: Los Angeles Community College District, 1976.

Luskin, B.J. Coastline Community College: A Dream With A Reality. Fountain Valley, Calif.: Coastline Community College, 1976a. 17pp. ED 129 371.

Luskin, B.J. Personal Communication. Fountain Valley, Calif.: Coastline Community College, Office of the President, November 1, 1976b.

Luskin, B.J. Personal Communication. Fountain Valley, Calif.: Coastline Community College, Office of the President, December 13, 1976c.

Mahlberg, L. WCC Looks at First Six Years Bellingham, Wash.: Whatcom Community College, 1976.

Maner, A.H. Postsecondary Occupational Education Needs Study for the Lower Eastern Shore. A Proposal. Annapolis: Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1975. 82pp. ED 108 715.

Ma icopa Technical Community College (Arizona). Progress and Prospect: A Report Submitted to the Governing Board of the Maricopa County Community College District. Phoenix, Ariz., 1976.

Master Plan for the City Colleges of Chicago. Palo Alto, Calif.: Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Davis MacConnell Ralston Division, 1974. 186pp. ED 093 421.

McIntyre, C.E., and Wales, C.A. Evaluation of a Non-Traditional College: Costs and Effectiveness. Seattle: Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1976.

Mertes, D.H. Part-Time Faculty: Who, Why, When, and Where? Presentation given at the Annual Conference of the California Community Junior College Association, San Diego, November, 1975.

Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri). "And Now For Something Completely Different--Pioneer Community College." Impressions

76, 1 (2): 1-4; March 1976a.

Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri). "Community Renewal College: A New Concept for New Clienteles." 1985 Master Plan. Kansas City, Mo., 1975. 391pp. ED 111 456.

Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri). "Educational Alternatives Or How to Start Learning and Quit Worrying About a Degree." Impressions 76, 1 (5): 1-5; June 1976b.

Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri). "Financing a Community College." Impressions 76, 1 (1): 1-5; February 1976c.

Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri). [Job Description for Associate Dean of Administrative Affairs.] Kansas City, Mo., 1976d.

Parker, C.A., and Vecchitto, D. "A Noncampus System for Vermont." New Directions for Community Colleges, 1 (2): 27-37; Summer 1973.

Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study (California). Fall 1976 Course Offerings. Berkeley, Calif., pamphlet, 1976.

Peralta Community Colleges (California). Part-Time Teachers: An Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Staffing and Compensation in the Peralta Community Colleges. Oakland, Calif.: Office of Educational Services, 1974.

Pima County Community College District (Arizona). Information for Temporary Part-Time Associate Faculty of the Community Campus, 1976-1977. Tucson, Ariz., 1976.

Pioneer Community College (Missouri). Vital Information for Faculty. Kansas City, Mo., 1975.

Plosser, W.D., and Hammel, J.H. Temporary, Contract, or Regular? A Report About Court Cases Involving the Issues of the Status and Pay of Part-Time Faculty in California Community Colleges. Sacramento: California Community and Junior College Association, 1976.

Pressley, W.H., Jr. Cooperative Program and Facilities Planning,

Southern Maine Vocational Technical Institute--University of Maine at Portland-Gorham. Final Report: Higher Education Facilities Planning Grant. Augusta: Maine State Department of Educational and Cultural Services, 1973. 43pp. ED 100 417.

Smith, P.P. "College Without a Campus." New Directions for Community Colleges, 4 (1): 69-76; Spring 1976.

Spector, I. Personal Communication. Tucson, Ariz.: Pima Community College District, Office of the President, October 13, 1976.

Tapper, N. Peralta College For Non-Traditional Study: Planning Document, March 1976. Berkeley, Calif., 1976.

Thompson, C.J. Personal Communication. Costa Mesa, Calif.: Coast Community College District, Office of Business Affairs, January 25, 1977.

Vermont Community Colleges. Community Colleges of Vermont: Planning. Montpelier, Ver., 1973. 30pp. ED 082 733.

Wade, B., and Smith, P. "Survival in Vermont." Community and Junior College Journal, 47 (2): 3; October 1976.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). Agreement By and Between the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 21 and the Whatcom Community College Federation of Teachers. September 13, 1976a.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). Catalog 76/77. Bellingham, Wash., 1976b.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). Enrollment Program Summary: Student Profile Winter 1976. Bellingham, Wash., 1976c.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). "Facts About Whatcom Community College." Currents, Bellingham, Wash., 1974a.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). How a College Without a Campus Plans to House Its Services. Bellingham, Wash., November 8, 1972.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). Kellogg Proposal and Progress Report (September, 1975). Bellingham, Wash., 1975.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). Permanent Faculty Status:

Policy Adopted by the Board of Trustees, Whatcom Community College, Washington, December 24, 1974. Bellingham, Wash., 1974b. 11pp. ED 099 096.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). [Proposal to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for Funding of a Demonstration Project for a Non-Campus Based System of Delivery of Community College Educational Services.] Bellingham, Wash., 1974c.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). '76 Spring Quarter Class Schedule. Bellingham, Wash., 1976d.

Whatcom Community College (Washington). Student Survival Handbook. Bellingham, Wash., 1976e.

Note: Bracketed publication dates are approximate. Revised titles are also bracketed.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

80